EXHIBIT C

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 7129-25 Filed: 05/08/20 Entered: 05/08/20 15:06:44 Page 1

of 55

2.0

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In re:) Bankruptcy Case) No. 19-30088-DM
PG&E CORPORATION,) Chapter 11 and) Jointly Administered
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY,)
Debtors.)

APRIL 18, 2020

what I had and try to get my life back together. So it's a very important thing for me.

But I want to talk about this settlement that we're -- that we're dealing with now, kind of in kind of general terms, sort of put it into perspective, because a lot of things have happened since we originally filed, when we originally filed the lawsuit in superior court here in Chico, and then, obviously, things went a different direction with the bankruptcy. It set to change things radically.

What I want to talk about is this idea that we had, more or less, three of these bankruptcy plans that were at least practically considerable. The first one was that bondholder plan that we had first heard about. It sounded like a pretty good plan, and it turned out to not really have the substance that -- that we thought it did. I talked about that in my weekly update yesterday for -- for my clients in some detail, but the bottom line is that one, I don't think, was really supposed to be a plan.

And, Mikal, you talked about that. Appreciate that.

The other one is this proposal for this customer-owned utility or -- or community-owned utility which is a proposal put forth, and that really was never

Page 2

MR. WATTS: Good afternoon, folks. This is Mikal Watts. Thank you for dialing in to this weekend town hall. I think this is the fourth or fifth one that we've done. On the screen in the Zoom, we've got myself, we've got Roy Miller, and Joe Earley, as usual, but we've also got lawyers representing other large numbers of clients. Jerry Singleton. Wave at them, Jerry. Jim Frantz and Rich Bridgford and Elliot Adler are here as well.

2.0

What we'd like to do is start off with
just letting each of these lawyers -- because this is
kind of a joint town hall where we've got some of my
clients, some of Mr. Frantz's clients, some of Mr.
Bridgford's clients, some of Mr. Adler's clients, some
of Mr. Singleton's clients, as well as it's open to the
public, so what I'd like to do is start off with
allowing each of these fine lawyers the opportunity to
tell you what their thoughts are about the plan.
So, Joe, you want to go first? Joe
Earley.

MR. EARLEY: Yeah, thank you, Mikal.

For those people who don't know me, I want

to explain why this is -- this process is very important

to rebuild. I've lost everything, and I want to rebuild

to me personally, because I'm one of you people who need

Page 4

Page 3

developed or substantiated in any significant way.

And then we had the shareholder or the equity plan. That's the one where -- that was, you know, the half cash/half stock. That's the one we're voting on. We're voting on that because that was approved by the TCC. It was approved by the Governor. The Court said go ahead and vote on that. That's the one that was chosen. So that's the one that we have before us. It's the only plan on the table.

Then, all of a sudden, fairly recently we're hearing people screaming out that it's too risky, there is, you know, half the -- half the fund, the stock portion, that 6.75 billion in stock is -- that could fluctuate, it could go down. You know, could go up, could go down. But it's too risky because of that and there's too many unknowns. So they can't support that, that risky plan.

And so, you know, they said, wait for another plan and let's -- that's the problem, is there is really no other plan. The only thing that is potentially out there, because the bondholders are not doing a plan, is that this customer-owned utility as a possibility. It's the only thing that's mentioned as an alternative. I mean, I -- the reality is the -- if the equity plan we're supporting is risky because it's not

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc.

(800) 745-1101

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 7129-25 Filed: 05/08/20 Entered: 05/08/20 15:06:44 Page 2 of 55

Page 7 Page 5 1 guaranteed, well, you got to look at this -- this COU Jerry, can you hear me? 2 2 MR. SINGLETON: I can. Thank you, Mikal. proposal, because that's really risky. 3 What I -- what I want to -- what I would 3 I wanted to thank Mikal, Joe, and Roy for 4 4 like to do is kind of show you what just came up. You putting this on. I think it's very helpful. And, 5 5 know, former police chief Trostle has been kind of again, the idea here is that there is so many different 6 6 promoting this -- this COU plan, and they just -- he sources of information. What we wanted to do was to get 7 7 just shared something the other day, I think it was the attorneys who represent the largest groups, and 8 8 yesterday or last night about this; and I think it's collectively the -- the handful of attorneys on this 9 9 phone represent over 30,000 of the fire victims, and really telling what some people are asking us to get 10 into and to support. So the -- the -- the posting on --10 just make sure that everyone is getting the same 11 11 on Facebook was just a quick note on the other plan. information. 12 12 For those who question whether the other plan, the I wanted to address two things very 13 13 customer-owned utility plan has any formal composition, quickly. And I know everyone wants to get into the 14 you have to know that the COU consortium of city mayors, 14 questions, so this is not going to take too long. But I 15 15 counsel, county, et cetera, have approached banks, think these two points are important. The first is to 16 16 follow up on what Joe said. As soon as we heard about they've approached the banks and it's favorable and it 17 17 will be fast moving, should it be needed. But there the consumer-owned utility proposal, we looked into it 18 18 is -- there is no reason to spend time now formalizing very carefully. This is something that I've been 19 19 interested in for a long time. As many of you know, the plan. 20 20 Well, think about that. If we're talking I've been handling these fires for well over a decade, 21 21 about risky, that's risky. There is nothing of starting in 2007 in San Diego. 22 22 substance. If you actually go into the court documents And so the interplay between the 23 23 and you look at what the plan is supposed to be, it -investor-owned utilities, which is what PG&E is, and the 2.4 24 it's com- -- it's very, very unclear like that. It's municipal utilities, like, for example, SMUD, the 25 25 very undefined and it's unsubstantiated. That -- that's Sacramento utility, the LADWP in Los Angeles is Page 6 Page 8 1 just not a viable plan. It's not a viable alternative 1 something that I'm very interested in. And the problem 2 2 to what we have actually before us that is supported by with this proposal of the COU, the consumer-owned 3 actual financial backers and something that we can -- we 3 utility, is that it's not a plan. 4 Again, as soon as we heard about it, we 4 can actually rely on. 5 5 So I as an attorney representing, you contacted everyone who had mentioned it, and this 6 know, thousands of thousands of Camp Fire victims here, 6 includes not just Mayor Liccardo, who, as most of you 7 you know, around my hometown, I can't possibly advise my 7 know, was the San Jose mayor, he was one of the ones who 8 clients who need to recover, they need to recover what 8 initially proposed this idea in a letter to the CPUC on 9 9 they lost, they can't wait any longer than is necessary. November 5th that was signed by a number of other 10 So that's why we're very, very strongly supporting this 10 people, and he said, in essence, this would be a great 11 plan. It's the only plan. It's the only way we're 11 idea; we'd like the State of California to look into it. 12 going to get out on time for the -- based on the 12 And the State of California did look into it. Governor requirements of AB-1054. So that's why we're supporting 13 13 Newsom looked into it. And Scott Wiener, who is a 14 14 senator from the Bay Area, did so as well. 15 15 Thank you for listening. I'm glad we have And what the both the legislature and the 16 16 this opportunity to -- to answer a bunch of questions Governor decided is that they did not want to support

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

this type of a plan. Instead, they wanted a plan that

kept PG&E intact, but substantially improved it. And

we'll talk later on about the specific improvements that

future. But once the Governor decided to support this

plan and once the legislature decided they weren't going

and other things designed to prevent fires in the

to buy it, essentially, the COU plan became a

PG&E has made in terms of the hardening of the system

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

non-entity.

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

this is it.

his clients.

for everybody, because this is very important. It's

So thank you, Mikal.

very, very important for everyone to understand that

MR. WATTS: All right. Thank you.

is a joint telephonic -- telephonic town hall, I'm going

to switch it over to Jerry Singleton and let him talk to

So now what we're going to do, since this

Page 9 Page 11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

21

24

25

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

We've also reached out to every attorney who's mentioned it, and this includes the attorneys who filed Document 306. And if you're interested in that, that's the only public mention in the bankruptcy court documents of this idea, and they make very clear it's not a plan; it's just a proposal that they would like to see come to fruition sometime in the future. Document 306. It's on Mikal's website. It's on our website. Or you can go on Prime Clerk and look at it yourself. And it makes crystal clear that it is not a plan. It's something that would have to be filed in court with a motion, and that was never done.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The other thing that makes crystal clear is that it's going to require \$59 billion in cash financing. Now, obviously, the idea that we could wait until May 15th, if this plan were approved, and then somehow come up with, in 45 days, 59 billion in cash, you know, I think everyone knows just how unrealistic that is. The bottom line is the COU is a nice idea, but, unfortunately, there is no money behind it, and no one has been able to identify any banks or any financial institutions that have been willing to put up money; and without money, these bankruptcy plans, again, are ideas; they're not plans.

The second thing that I wanted to address

cash that they need for this deal, and that was the best they can do.

So whether you support it or whether you are opposed to it, this is the deal. It's not going to change. And so what I advise my clients is make sure you educate yourself. Take your time. But once you've decided whether you're going to vote, we encourage you to vote right away, because this is an incredibly important event in everyone's lives, and we want to make sure that your vote counts.

As always, we're here to answer any questions, and we look forward to doing that.

(Music playing.)

MR. WATTS: Who's that?

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have no idea. 16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not our phone.

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, I'm not sure 18 who has that music going, but they've got music playing

19 in the background right now. 20

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I -- I don't know. It's playing music still.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's kind of nice. 23

MR. WATTS: Okay. There we go. Guys, I apologize. I tried to move the phone, and I hung -- I hung up myself. So we're back. This is Mikal Watts,

Page 10

was the idea that victims should wait and vote later on, after the plan has been renegotiated. The reason I want to address that is that the plan is not going to be renegotiated. This is the deal. We've gone back and forth extensively, and we've come up with what we believe is a very good deal for victims.

Typically, in bankruptcy you're looking at getting paid in several years. Usually, it's about four to five years, and you get pennies on the dollar. Here, we have a deal that, if it works, if it's approved and if it goes forward, it's going to pay people, we believe, a hundred cents on the dollar for their losses, but certainly in the area of 90 to a hundred, and it's going to pay them within two years. In bankruptcy that is unheard of.

So, again, we strongly support this deal. We believe it is in everyone's best interest. But PG&E has made crystal clear they are not going to renegotiate it. There is a lot of reasons for that. No. 1 is that they simply don't have the money. If they would have had the cash and our financial advisers would have said there is cash available to require either a hundred percent payment in cash or a larger amount payment in cash, we would have insisted upon that. But, as it is, PG&E is scrambling to come up with the 6.75 billion in Page 12

and we still have music.

Any ideas?

3 Let's see if we can go to Jim Frantz.

Jim, are --

MR. FRANTZ: I'm ready.

MR. WATTS: Okay. Try to talk over the music, if you would.

MR. FRANTZ: Someone turned it off.

MR. WATTS: Yeah, go ahead.

10 MR. FRANTZ: So I want to thank Jerry 11 and -- and Joe for what they just said. It was

12 absolutely accurate and on the money. I haven't heard

13 from virtually any lawyer, there is about two or three

14 that I know of, that are against the plan. Hundreds of

15 lawyers that are working on this case are all supportive

16 of the plan. So we have several hundred legal minds

17 that have analyzed it. We've got the Governor of the

18 State of California that agrees with it. So far we got

19 the Judge Montali who agrees with it. So those that say

20 no or don't vote for the plan, in my opinion, are

21 virtually crazy when they say that, because there's no

22 other plan. So you don't vote for this plan, you're not

going to have another plan. There is going to be no

23

24 money in the near future for you, period. 25 We've got such a great plan put together.

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

Page 13 Page 15

reasonable amount of time.

we really look forward to doing that.

victims adequate protection under AB-1054 to not get

knocked out by a future fire in the next year or two.

feasible option that will compensate fire victims in a

MR. WATTS: Thank you, Elliot.

Rich Bridgford, you represent several thousands of people. What do you want to tell them

MR. BRIDGFORD: Can you hear me okay,

MR. WATTS: I can. Thank you. Go ahead,

MR. BRIDGFORD: Yes. As Mikal said, my

name is Rich Bridgford of Bridgford, Gleason & Artinian,

and I work with Jim Frantz and Pat McNicholas, a

three-firm team on this case. I first want to say that

I am privileged and honored as to all those clients that

we have on the line, to be working with you and to be

working with Mikal and the other attorneys on this call

imperfectly, albeit imperfectly, making those who have

as a team, to hold PG&E accountable and that I think

We are here to answer your questions, and

This plan may not be perfect, but it is the only

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

5

6

about it?

Mikal?

sir.

- We worked on it last year and all of this year. And
- Mikal Watts and others spent a considerable amount of
- 3 time putting it together with the investment folks and
- 4 so forth. So my dad told me when I was a young man,
- 5 don't look a gift horse in the mouth. This is a great
- 6 deal. It's \$13.5 billion in bankruptcy court. It's
- 7 unprecedented. I've heard of no other deal like this
- 8 that's created in bankruptcy court. We could be stuck
- 9 in bankruptcy court for five more years if we don't get

10 this thing put through.

2

11

12

2

10

14

- So my -- my recommendation to all of our clients, listen to what we say today and make your
- 13 decision, but I don't think there is any other decision.
- 14 It's not a perfect plan. Half of it's stock, half of
- 15 it's cash. It's the best plan we could have. And the
- 16 stock may very well be worth more money than the
- 17 6.7 billion we get in stock. It may end up being a lot
- 18 more than 13.5 billion when we -- when we find the stock
- 19 price. But this is the only alternative that we have, 20 and we have to go for it. That's my view.
- 21 Thank you.
- 22 MR. WATTS: Thank you, Jim.
- 23 You know, there are folks arguing against
- 24 the plan, but part of what we're trying to do here is
- 25 have an inter- -- interactive process where we can get

Page 16

Page 14

- 1 you information on our views, but, just as importantly,
 - that you can get your questions answered, and so there
- 3 is a -- there is a technology that if you press star 3,
- 4 you're going to be able to get your questions in here.
- 5 We got about an hour's worth of -- of questions that
- 6 we've already gotten to get to, but hopefully we'll have
- 7 a good half an hour or so of your questions today that
- 8 we'll be able to answer. 9
 - So before we do that, let me -- Elliot Adler, are you on the phone? I know we can't see you,
- 11 but are you on the phone?
- 12 MR. ADLER: Yes. Yes, I am.
- 13 MR. WATTS: Go ahead, sir.
 - MR. ADLER: Thank you, Mikal. My name is
- 15 Elliot Adler, and I represent a large number of the fire
- 16 victims. I don't want to be repetitive. I know that
- 17 y'all must be eager to get to the questions, so I'll be
- brief. I support the plan because, first, I believe 18
- 19 \$13 and a half billion is a fair settlement number
- 2.0 within the confines of this bankruptcy. \$13 and a half
- 21 billion will go a long way to compensate fire victims
- 22 and help them rebuild their homes and their lives.
- 23 Second, this plan that's up for a vote is
- 24 the only one that can be approved in time to allow PG&E 25
 - to exit bankruptcy by June 30th and also give fire

suffered whole.

2 So I just want to run through a few 3 reasons why we strongly support the plan. First of all,

that we're close, after a lot of suffering, to

4

as you heard, it's the only plan, and in that respect, there is, in my opinion, no realistic community or state

funded plan. The Governor supports the equity PG&E plan

7 that is before you that we are recommending. Second of

8 all, I believe the legislature does not support the

9 community plan at this time. And, third of all, from

10 everything I've seen and as Jerry touched on, the

11 chances that they can raise 60 billion before AB-1054

12 and PG&E is required to exit bankruptcy is nil.

13 The second thing I want to say in regards

14 to this being the only plan is that I don't believe the

15 bondholders' plan was ever really a plan. Nothing that 16

I saw would lead me to conclude that it was, but, 17 regardless of that, the bondholders have now, through

18 their counsel, supported our plan, the equity plan.

19

They are in support of it. My understanding is they've

20 gone elsewhere with their capital.

21 The second thing that I would like to say 22 briefly is that that just to touch on some of the risks

23 if we were not to approve this plan. The most important

24 risk that I see in not obtaining approval for this plan 25 is that if PG&E does not exit bankruptcy for the only

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

plan that is before the voters, this plan, that it will not qualify for AB-1054 money; and if there are future fires, I'm not a bankruptcy lawyer, but my understanding is that on those future fires, those people may have priority over our victims and clients here. PG&E must receive the 1054 money in order to remediate against

future fires and to cover any potential risk there.

Second of all, if this plan is not approved, we're going to lose our funding. We live in a regulated capitalistic society, and the funding which has been made available, a number of people working on that took a lot of time, that's all going to go away. We can't risk that.

Third of all, a great number of people, attorneys, have worked on a number of deals, leadership in this case with FEMA, with Cal- -- with the California entities, with subrogation. All those deals, we're going to lose them all if this plan doesn't get approved.

And, last of all, as has been touched on, I think we would look for instead of being compensated in record time, in two years, we would be looking at years of delay.

So the last thing I want to say is not just the risk, but why do I -- why do I like this plan?

In summary, there is no such thing as a perfect bankruptcy plan, but this is the best and this is the only plan before us. If this plan is voted yes, we eliminate the risk of losing the Wall Street funding, we eliminate the risk of losing the deals that we've

we eliminate the risk of losing the deals that we've made with the insurance companies, FEMA, the California entities, we eliminate the risk of PG&E losing access to the 1054 money. And, most importantly, we eliminate the

9 delay in getting you compensated.

Thank you.

MR. WATTS: Okay. And then, lastly, before we start the questions, again, we want this to be interactive. So type in star 3 with your questions, and we'll get to those in a bit.

But before we do that, our last introductory speaker is my friend Roy Miller. Roy and I met within days after the -- the Tubbs Fire burned down his house.

Roy, I hope you're back in your home. Tell us what your view is both as a victim and as a lawyer.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mikal, and good afternoon, everyone. Actually, we are back in our home as of last July, and we're grateful for that. I know a lot of our clients are still working on the rebuild

Page 18

touched on, we're in bankruptcy. That means the claims are impaired. Nonetheless, I believe that relative to the other groups of creditors, the victims here are not receiving the discounts on their claims, as Jerry

Why do I support it? Well, first of all, as has been

receiving the discounts on their claims, as Jerry touched on. If we receive the stock and the cash, which is backstopped by \$12 billion, then we stand to receive

a higher percentage than the other people. The stock is in addition to the cash.

The last thing I want to touch on in regards to the advantages of the plan, and there's been confusion on this, is that the stock that the victims' trust fund will receive -- no victim has to take stock. The victims' trust fund will receive that stock. It will be managed by top flight financial professionals. It's not all going to be unloaded, that stock is in a new company that's very important to understand, and that new company is not going to be saddled by the following liabilities: It won't be saddled by the victims' claims, it won't be saddled by FEMA and the California claims, it won't be saddled by the other creditor claims; and, most importantly, if they exit bankruptcy by June, it will have available to it over \$10 billion

for future remediation of fires.

Page 20

Page 19

process, and it's been difficult. But as complex as

this case and as a bankruptcy is, people out there listening to this call need to understand something.

4 You-all hired your lawyers for a reason, and your

5 lawyers have worked very hard for over two years to

bring one of the most difficult companies to justice for
 the fires that they caused and the lives that they've

the fires that they caused and the lives that they've
 affected, and it has been a monumental task fought every

step of the way.

The settlement that we reached with them on December 6th of last year isn't perfect, but it is fair. And my clients have made it very clear to me that they want to be compensated and they want this to be over. And as complex as this case is and going into bankruptcy makes it more complex, still, we are within sight of the finish line; and so what we want to do is make sure you have the information you need to make an informed choice. We are recommending that you vote to accept.

For my clients, you can continue to call or e-mail me with questions. I'm working from home, like many of you are. So my time is your time. We will get your questions answered. And we look forward to getting the compensations to you as soon as possible.

Thank you.

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

Page 23

1 MR. WATTS: All right, great.

2.0

Well, enough -- enough lawyer speeches. We're going to get to questions that have been asked. This next session, which will last about an hour, is questions that we got sent to us before today by fire victims, and so we promise to answer those first. But, again, so that you can get in the queue, type in star 3, and any questions that you have, we're going to get to them

So the first thing I'd like to do is just go down a series of questions that have been sent to us. Jerry Singleton, why don't you take the

first one. The first one is, what happened to the bondholder plan?

MR. SINGLETON: Sure, and that's a good question. A lot of people remember that last year the bondholders filed a motion and received permission from the Court to put forth an alternative plan. Now, I know Rich and Mikal and several people have talked about whether or not that was actually a viable plan or if it was just a negotiating tactic by the bondholders. But, regardless, it worked out very well for us because we were able to leverage the bondholders' offer to get PG&E to increase the overall value by about 5 billion. So it worked out very well for us.

The next question we got, it says, do you think this is a good amount for the fire victims to accept? I prefer the phrase "fire survivors."

But, Joe Earley, do you think this is a good amount, this \$13 and a half billion is a good amount for the fire survivors to accept?

MR. EARLEY: Yeah, I mean, that's a great question because, you know, what it -- yes and no. I mean, no, only because it'll never -- there is never going to be enough. I've spent, gaw, I don't -- we've talked to hundreds of groups of people, and I've consistently let people know that at least we understand that the things that we lost, especially the -- the sentimental things, the things that can never be replaced and that no one really will have a full appreciation for the value except for us, that stuff is priceless and irreplaceable, and there will never be enough money available to replace that. It's impossible. So from that perspective, there is no way it can be done. It's absolutely impossible.

But from the -- from the real world perspective -- you got to remember this. I've tried to stress this. Lawsuits, generally, lawsuits, you know, the -- the kind of litigation, tort litigation that goes on in superior court, those are designed to try to

Page 22

But here's what essentially happened with the bondholders: On January 27th they filed an RSA with the court, and, essentially, what that means is that they made a deal with PG&E where they agreed to withdraw their plan and support PG&E, and, in exchange, PG&E made some concessions that they were asking for regarding their bonds. So to read a little bit of that for you, it says, specifically, and this is from Page 10, By resolving all these issues, the note holder RSA streamlines the debtors' path toward a timely confirmation of the amended plan well within the June 30, 2020 deadline established by AB-1054, expedites distribution to holders of fire victims' claims, and allows the debtors to emerge as a stronger, more financially sound utility.

In essence, what's happening there is what the mediator Judge Newsome, no relation to Gavin Newsom, but a retired bankruptcy judge, asked the bondholders and the equity holders to do, to essentially combine their resources to make PG&E stronger. That's what they've done. And as a result the bondholders' plan has been withdrawn. So that's why when people talk about a bondholder plan, while it was correct that at one point

in time there was one, there is not one now.

MR. WATTS: Thank you, Jerry.

Page 24

compensate the victims of -- of injuries and losses, and that's where we started, right. But bankruptcy, which is, you know, what PG&E elected to -- to go into, that -- that system is very different. That's not designed to compensate victims of -- of -- for their injuries and their losses. That's designed to keep the company alive and viable. And on a bigger scale, a bigger picture, that's important, right. That's how our economy survives and all that. That's why we're a great nation.

But the reality is that we are not the ones that are designed to be helped in this. Now, we are very fortunate because it's a -- PG&E is not just a regular ol' company, like the -- like the nursing homes that I would -- that I sued. They're -- this is a quasi governmental public entity. So there are other issues that are involved in this, and there are politics that are involved in this that have become very, very valuable for us. And having the Governor doing what he did with AB -- when he signed AB-1054 was -- really, that was for our benefit, so we don't get drawn out into this long, normal bankruptcy process, which is forever, right.

So it's -- it's important that we all understand that we're getting more in this settlement,

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

1

2

3

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

if we adopt this settlement, have it confirmed. This is, like, the largest, one of the largest settlements

in -- in history, and that's important to understand.

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

This is more than the big cases we've all heard about, the Enron and Worldcom, the BP oil spill, Exxon Valdez.

I mean, those were big, big, big cases. This is bigger.

This is like that and bigger. So it's absolutely unprecedented.

We need to appreciate that, that while it's not going to be able to compensate us for all of our losses, all of our trees and the beauty that we had and the comfort and all, it'll never be enough. But, boy, under the circumstances we are absolutely very fortunate, and, yes, the answer in that -- from that perspective is it's a good amount. I believe very strongly that it's the best amount that we could have -that we could have had, that people worked real hard at negotiating this. And they're not fools. They don't just -- they worked hard at these negotiations, and they know what they're doing.

So while I -- we're not going to get a hundred cents on the -- on the dollar, we're going to get -- we're going to get as much as -- I think, as we can and -- and I think we need to be happy about that and that we need to -- to even move forward and get that I believe, is that they filed Chapter 11. It expedited

Page 27

Page 28

getting this case resolved. We're all sitting here now

talking about the \$13.5 billion. We're not litigating

4 the liability. We were -- I mean, worst -- or the

5 tactics by the defense on the liability. Even though we

6 have the liability, they were milking that case to 7

kingdom come, and we would have still been doing that right now and next year and possibly the next year,

before we ever got to this point.

So we are very lucky that the case went down the way it did. I was hopeful when they filed the 11, that we would move quicker into resolution and getting their head straight on what to do. They were -they were concerned about the fire power we had, frankly. We have some great lawyers that have been litigating this case.

So I've heard virtually nothing, except for a handful of lawyers that have very, very few cases. And I don't know why they're disagreeing with it. It's ludicrous. 13.5 billion goes a very long way. It's not going to bring back the lives that were lost, never, and you can't really put a price tag on that, but the courts do that in every case. And I think we've got the money now that we can make everyone reasonably whole in this case. And all the lawyers, for the most part, are fully

Page 26

1

done so we can get our lives at least together as much as we -- we can under these circumstances.

So thank you for that question.

MR. WATTS: Thank you, Joe. Yeah, you know, it's interesting, your answer, in addition to \$13 and a half billion being, I think it's the third largest tort settlement in history, your point about the amount of time that we're saving is huge. The Exxon Valdez litigation lasted more than 20 years. It went up

and down to the Supreme Court three times and ultimately were paid a fraction of the jury verdict and certainly

not as much as the fire survivors here are being paid.

The Enron bankruptcy lasted, I think it was nine years, and people got paid less than 10 cents on the dollar.

The BP oil spill litigation, this amount is more than the individuals got there.

Jim, you kind of already answered this question with your opening speech, but what are you hearing about whether the, you know, the majority of the lawyers involved in this case are actually supporting the plan?

MR. FRANTZ: I've heard, like I said earlier, nothing but comments of how great it is. \$13.5 billion in the bankruptcy court. Just think about that. The best thing that happened to us in this case,

supportive of this.

MR. WATTS: Yeah, I think there was a Bloomberg article on April the 3rd where we were quoted at the time about 9,000 of our clients had voted and nearly unanimously in favor of the plan. I think Mr. Singleton was quoted about the response has been overwhelming. Mike Danko, who represents about 6,000 people, said his victims were supporting the plan. You, Mr. Frantz, said that almost all your clients were supporting the deal. And I think Mr. Bridgford said he believed his clients would overwhelmingly support it. So your -- your -- your experience is certainly similar

What I want to do now is take a couple of questions, and it's kind of the yes or the no. Roy Miller, if the clients vote yes and the plan is confirmed, what are the mechanics of the claim process and the payments that are going to be made if we vote to accept this plan?

MR. MILLER: Okay. So right now the bankruptcy court has already appointed John Trotter, who is a former appeals court Judge, and Cathy Yanni, who administered the wildfire assistance program, as claims administrator. So the mechanics are, basically, as follows: They're working on a rules-making process

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

right now, which I expect will be done roughly in the next eight weeks or so. They'll also develop forms and a format. They will then set out a time period for all of our clients to put their individual claims in to be examined.

2.0

During the claims period the claims will be submitted to the trust via what's called a third-party administrator, basically, a logistics firm called Brown & Greer. For those that are represented by lawyers, we'll be making those claims on their behalf. We're going through our client files between now and the end of the summer, when I expect the claims period will open.

Once it closes, Brown & Greer will apply the rules of the trust to the claims that were made during the time period and will recommend a suggested amount for each individual fire survivor. You as a survivor can then accept the suggested amount and receive it very quickly or seek to have that number adjusted upward. This request for an adjustment, kind of like a first level of appeal is done through Brown & Greer if you or you and your lawyer can show that somehow Brown & Greer made a mistake in how they applied the rules or they missed some information in their

the answer is I don't believe there is a better settlement option if this plan fails.

But the first thing I want to do is give you some important background from some previous cases that I've been involved in affecting why we did things the way we did them here. The second thing is I want to disclose some financial and banking arrangements that I have that got me access to several of the principals we ended up negotiating with in this case. The third thing is I want to tell you about all four of the options we considered from my perspective before recommending the equity plan that you're now being asked to vote on. The fourth thing is I want to tell you about those options that are still being talked about on social media and just briefly address some of the information I have about why they're not really there and give you -- I'll tell you why it's my opinion that there is not a better settlement option if this plan fails.

So let me give you some background as to why it is that we or at least my firm did what we did here. I do a lot of these mass tort cases all around the country involving tens of thousands of clients at once. In this case every one of my wildfire clients had to give me a picture ID when you signed up with us here in the California fire case. A lot of you asked me why.

Page 30

Following that review, a final suggested claims payout will be issued by BrownGreer, which you can then either accept or you can appeal up to what's called a neutral third-party person that's selected by the trustee. That person will hear your objection. They may supply additional information, and then that person will make a decision on what the right number is. You can then agree with that number or -- and be paid, or there is a final level of appeal in which there are three neutrals that will act as a panel to review your information of your appeal and then render a -- what is called a final decision. Once the final decision is made by that panel, the payment will then be made.

This process I just described will be for all 70,000 plus claimants. It is a very large logistics operation, but we expect that they're going to be able to handle it because they're going to be staffing up to deal with it. And eventually all the money that's being put into the trust will be distributed and then the trust will close.

MR. WATTS: Okay, wonderful. Well, I'm going to use executive privilege here and take the no question, and that is could there be a better settlement option if this plan fails. I want to take my time here and give you an extraordinary amount of detail as to why

Page 32

Page 31

Well, typically, guys like me that try a lot of lawsuits have those cases referred to them by other law firms, and then I do the litigation part.

But about ten years ago I got burned by some criminals down in Mississippi who made up some BP oil spill cases and sent them to me. These guys stole about \$10 million from me and sent over fake clients and stole their Social Security numbers to hide what they'd done. But based on the client contracts and the questionnaires and the tax authorizations that they sent me, I filed those claims as lawsuits against BP and then worked on the case for about two and a half years.

Unfortunately, I found myself indicted along with a bunch of other criminals who stole from me. And I knew I didn't do anything, so I defended myself in court. And in August of 2016, a federal jury exonerated me on all those charges. But to show that justice can get it done, I proved up the two individuals who ripped me off committed the fraud, and those individuals are now in federal prison serving sentences of seven and 17 years.

Why do I bring that up? Well, first, I've talked about this in previous town halls with my clients, and I want to repeat it to you guys now. I think right now there is an article in Atlantic Weekly

8 (Pages 29 to 32)

magazine that's been published with the ten-year anniversary of the oil spill. I'm also writing a book about it. Someday there is going to be a documentary produced about it.

2.0

But, second, why does that affect what we're doing here? Well, the claims process is going to be structured in a way that only legitimate claims are being paid. That's the goal of the trustee and the claims administrator. I required your photo IDs in order to sign up with me because I wanted to confirm that it was you who hired me and it was you that wanted to file a claim. It's also the reason we collected your cell numbers and your e-mail addresses, so I could make sure that I was communicating with real victims with real claims. It's also the reason that I did town hall meetings in person over and over and over again, so I could personally look you in the whites of the eyes and answer the questions that you got. And, frankly, it was the reason we had planned on doing these kinds of calls as in-person town hall meetings during the vote. I'd talked to Mr. Singleton and Mr. Frantz and Mr. Bridgford, among others, about, you know, getting together with all of our clients and talking to them. But then the shelter in place order for the coronavirus, now we had to use new technology. But it's also the

1 from various banks around the United States for all 23

2 of those years. I used to bank at local Texas banks

3 like Frost and Texas State and Community Bank. But

4 since 2016 I've banked with more national institutions

5 from Virginia and New York. As you know, interest rates

 $\,\,$ 6 $\,\,$ $\,$ go up or down with the economy, so whenever you get the

chance, you refinance and get lower rates. So I lowered
 my interest rates. On September 17th of 2019 I secured

my interest rates. On September 17th of 2019 I secured for my law firm a hundred-million-dollar credit facility

for my law firm a hundred-million-dollar credit facility
 with a bank called Stifel that offered me substantially

lower interest rates than what I had been paying. The

credit agreement that I had gave that lender the right, without a prior consent of any credit party, including

myself, to sell or to assign or to transfer a portion of those credit documents, and so they did that.

 $Some body -- \ listen, \ you -- \ Mr. \ Frantz, \\ thank \ you.$

And so they did that. And so why is that important? Well, they had the right at any time at their sole discretion, without notice to me, to sell or to bring participants into that loan. Those people are called assignees. Those assignees are the person that introduced me to the principals on both sides of the fight in this case, which was very, very valuable in terms of getting us the benefit of those negotiations.

Page 34

reason that we negotiated for the right to and are obtaining the votes digitally. When we text you or e-mail your vote, there is a digital copy created that tells us, there is a record that tells us that it came from your cell phone number and your e-mail address, so that we know that it's your vote. With all the physical dislocation of the fire victims from house to house or apartment to apartment after the fire, I wanted to make sure that paper ballots weren't picked up by some imposter that voted in your name. So with digital

ballots, we know that your ballot came from you.

And third, the reason I gave you this
background is that I developed certain financial banking
relationships that are important here for the backdrop
of who we negotiated with and how. So let me do that.
I want to disclose some of those relationships to you
and explain how that really got us access to some of the
people that we've been talking to. I've been practicing
law for more than three decades. As I joke, I used to
have a full head of hair when I started, but now I'm
bald as I can be. I've owned my own law firm since
about 1997, 23 years. And I operate a large law firm.
I've got about 25 lawyers and over a hundred people who
work for me.

And we've got access to credit facilities

Page 36

Page 35

Two of those assignees were companies called Centerbridge and Apollo, although I didn't know that originally.

So the third thing I want to do is tell you how those relationships led to introductions to the people that we ended up negotiating with. Now, I'll give you a timeline just so everybody's got the facts. As you'll recall, on January 30th, 2019 PG&E filed for bankruptcy. Under the bankruptcy rules PG&E normally had the exclusive right to propose an exit plan, and so they had that exclusivity. But despite that exclusivity, early last summer the bondholders, the people who hold the debt of PG&E decided to try to take over the company, in effect. And so they put out a plan that basically said we're going to pay the fire victims a total of about \$5 and a half billion.

Now, on behalf of you, the fire victims, or the fire survivors, we poured water on that, said that was not near enough money. So PG&E in June then proposed a plan to match that 5 and a half billion with something that cost about \$14 billion to pay all the victims and all the insurance companies and all the local government and state and federal governments, but it was woefully inadequate.

Fortunately for us, as Jerry mentioned, on

9 (Pages 33 to 36)

1

2

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

7

8

9

21

22

23

24

25

- June 20, 2019 the Governor proposed a plan known as
- AB-1054. This set up a 20.5-billion-dollar fund to
- 3 cover the cost of future wildfires. Importantly for

1

2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

4

6

7

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

25

- 4 you, AB-1054 required that to participate in it, PG&E
- 5 has to exit bankruptcy by June 30, 2020. That gave us
- 6 incredible leverage against PG&E that they couldn't
- 7 string us out, as they've done or companies do in these
- 8 other bankruptcies. So that was a good piece of
- 9 legislation. So I can say this, AB-1054 was the rocket
- 10 fuel that allowed the parties to borrow the money and

issue the stock that they needed to in order to pay you, the fire survivors.

The market agreed with that. On June the 20th, the day that Governor Newsom proposed the plan, the value of PG&E stock went up 14.9 percent in a single day. So then the bondholders trying to take over the company countered that a week later, well, if you're going to pay 14 billion, we'll pay 16, 18 billion. Mind you, that's not money for you the victims, you're inside of that, but that plan would have gotten the fire victims about \$7 and a half billion.

On the same day Judge Montali said, okay, we have to have a deadline for all the claims. You guys remember an October 21, 2019 deadline known as the bar date. That is, to participate in the settlement, you

Page 39 offer to about 8.4 billion. And then what happened was

- the TCC went and used the bondholders to do a plan that
- 3 was \$13 and a half billion in cash and stock, 50/50.
 - Apollo Capital Management and Elliot Management Group
- 5 were the leaders of that plan that would put \$29.2
- billion of new money in and pay the victims \$13 and a
 half billion of half cash and half stock.

So what I'd like to do now is take you back to those financing arrangements that I've got and tell you how it is that those folks introduced me to the principals that we all negotiated with.

On October the 4th I was at a hearing in South Carolina on a water pollution case that has nothing to do with this and I received a call from a gentleman from Centerbridge called Gavin Baiera and he said he'd like to meet and so we set up a time. We were both going to be in San Francisco on the 7th, so we said we would meet.

The very next day PG&E announced that it had secured \$34.45 billion in debt refinancing for its reorganization plan. That was about 5 billion more than the bondholders. So on the 7h, we all went to San Francisco. Mr. Singleton and I were in the jury box listening at the same time right next to each other, and this motion about lifting exclusivity -- recall that

Page 38

- had to get your claims in on that date or lose them
- forever. Now, through some processes we got that
- 3 extended to December the 31st, but the bottom line is is
 - that everybody that's going to be able to recover got
- 5 their claim in by the deadline. So that happened on
 - June the 26th. And -- and once the market got wind that this company was going to get out of bankruptcy, on that
- 8 day, June the 27th, the stock closed at \$23.59 a share.
- 9 So that's the best evidence I can give you as to where
- this stock ought to be but for all these other problemsthat we're processing through.

that we're processing through.
 Governor Newsom s
 July the 12th, and then PG&E

Governor Newsom signed AB-1054 into law on July the 12th, and then PG&E in August proposed paying the victims \$7 and a half billion. The bondholders then went up on the 16th of August and said, you know what, we'll offer 8.4 billion and we want the Court to get rid of this exclusivity. And the Judge said no originally, so PG&E maintained the exclusive right to set the plan.

But two things happened that month.

No. 1, on August 17 Judge Montali lifted the stay and allowed a group of about 15 older Tubbs claimants to

- pursue their claims in state court. I think
 Mr. Singleton represented a couple of those. But the
- bottom line, that gave us pressure.
 - On September the 9th, PG&E raised their

Page 40

- back in August the Judge had said no, but on October the
 - 9th, Judge Montali had agreed to a dual plan approach.
- 3 And part of what he said is a dual track plan going
- 4 forward may facilitate negotiations for a global
- 5 resolution and narrow the issues which are in legitimate 6 dispute.

And, boy, was he right. We had two horses running the race, in effect, and we had a -- we had a contest to see who could come up with the most money by

- a time that we could, in effect, get the plan confirmed.
- All of our experts had told us that the CPUC may take as many as five or six months, so we gave ourselves a
- tentative deadline at the end of the year. But then
- something strange happened. The Kincade Fire started on
- October the 23rd, and we were all very concerned because, as Mr. Bridgford said, if that – if that fire
- had burned down Santa Rosa, as the Tubbs Fire had, all
 of those new claims would have been what's called
- administratively in front of you. So that was the big problem.

Mr. Baiera of Centerbridge did not want to stop trading the stock because he was trying to sell out at the time. So he introduced me to a gentleman by the name of Tom Wagner with Knighthead Capital, who I'd never met before. And I've not spoken with Mr. Baiera

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

at Centerbridge about these negotiations since. That happened on the 25th.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

And then, basically, on a somewhat daily basis since the 25th, I've been working with Mr. Wagner on behalf of the equity folks to try to optimize this deal to make it as good as it can be for the fire survivors

On November the 5th a gentleman by the name of William Jones with Apollo Financials introduced me to a guy named Chris Lahoud who was working on Apollo's bondholder side. So I immediately did some research to try to figure out the scale these two companies' respective involvements in both sides of this deal and here's what I've learned and I've updated this based on year-end financials. Centerbridge is not a very important player in this deal. They're only the 18th largest shareholder. I think they own 1.46 percent of the company as of the end of last year, about \$84 million worth of shares based on a \$10.87 per share price on the end of the year. They got a backstop in this deal of about 325 million. So their total investment is about \$408.7 million. Apollo, on the other side, has

23 24 \$506 million of the senior notes, \$124 million of the 25 DIP term loans. That's that original financing that

1 November until December the 6th, trying to get the

- bondholders to actually send in a contractually binding
- 2
- 3 term sheet that said that they would do what they
- 4 promised to do, and that is put up \$13.5 billion in cash
- 5 and stock. I reviewed those e-mails this morning and 6
- several e-mails, one after the other after the other 7 asking for them to come forward with an actual binding
 - commitment to put up the money. I said, send it, and

they never did. It was kind of weird.

billion of state moneys.

Right around Thanksgiving time this community-owned utility, this customer-owned utility idea was filed on November the 24th, Document No. 306. This was an idea that was just proposed by San Jose's mayor, Sam Liccardo, and Oakland's mayor, Libby Schaaf. And so we ran it to ground. What we learned was, as Mr. Singleton said, it would require about \$59 billion in funding. And we learned that there was no way to get that funding without a state backstop, which would require legislation that would, in effect, incumber \$60

The Governor did at the time float it as a concept to consider, but I think it was more as a lever so that he could use to negotiate with whoever was going to win between the equity and the bondholders, to get a better deal for the State of California.

Page 42

kept the company going during bankruptcy. So that makes them the seventh largest bondholder with a total investment of more than \$630 million.

So as I look at these two folks that I've just been introduced to, Apollo's investment was 54 percent higher than the Centerbridge investment. So I didn't really want to negotiate with somebody that only had 1.46 percent of the company, which is why I was introduced to Mr. Tom Wagner and Mr. David Abrams, who were the two leading pieces of the equity pie that were putting the deal together from the standpoint of the equity.

And then I did the same thing with Apollo, was introduced to some folks at Elliott Capital Management and some folks at PIMCO, who were the two largest participants in the bonds. I disclosed all of this to my fellow lawyers on the TCC and suggested that we all get together.

About that same time, Judge Montali ordered mediation. And, as somebody already mentioned, he appointed a former bankruptcy Judge by the name of Randall Newsome. And Judge Newsome has been a stalwart in forcing the parties together to work on this.

And so the bottom line is is that I had a series of communications between about the 16th of Page 44

Page 43

As you know, on December the 6th myself, Mr. Singleton, Mr. Bridgford, Mr. Frantz, a whole bunch of other people, so-called consenting fire claimant professionals, that's 13 of us that collectively represent over 70 percent of all the claims in the case, together with all 11 members of the Tort Claims Committee voted unanimously to suggest to the fire survivors that we go with the equity plan. So at the time we had unanimity.

I happened to be in New York a couple of weeks later. I met with Gavin Baiera from Centerbridge on an unrelated matter. I met with Tom Wagner from Knighthead on this matter. And the next morning, I met with William Jones and Chris Lahoud from Apollo, who told me at the time they thought the Governor was going to support their plan and so they wanted to keep the lines of communication open and I said that was certainly fine.

However, about a month later, on January the 27th, the equity and the bondholders breached the deal. The bondholders had been asking for these high levels of repayment on their bonds, and it's literally differences of hundreds of millions of dollars. And so what happened is the equity agreed to pay a slightly higher percentage yield on the bonds. The bondholders

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

2

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

12

13

16

17

said they would go away, and they did. And, more importantly, they agreed to support the equity plan, which they have.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

2.4

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, what happened in the spring? Between about January the 1st and March the 23rd, as we were preparing for this vote, the process really went away from the lawyers and towards Sacramento. The Governor's team went into negotiations with PG&E equity, and they had repetitive negotiations with the equity and the members of the Governor's Office.

There are certain persons in the Governor's Office, Ana Matosantos, Ann Patterson who did a lot of those negotiations for the Governor. I've met both of those individuals in various mediations. And Tom Wagner and David Abrams worked on behalf of the equity together with financial advisers for all of the different folks. The labor constituency at the IBEW was kept abreast. The financial backstop parties that we required them to go get, these \$12 billion in financial backstop parties were kept abreast.

And so around March the 20th I got the word, that was a Friday, that they had concluded their negotiations with the Governor, the Governor was pleased with the concessions they had given and intended to announce his support shortly.

1 wanted to help the deal. I asked them why they hadn't

participated in the offering. They had been given a

3 participatory right for equity financing. And of the

4 \$12 billion of the equity financing, they could do up to

5 2 and they didn't do a dollar. And he said something, 6

to give you some reason why they didn't participate, but 7 he let me know they wanted to help now. So when I asked

8 how, Chris Lahoud from Apollo said, well, he had heard

9 that some of the backstop parties may not have the

10 liquidity to swing their contractual obligations under 11

the backstop agreement and this might kill our deal, 12 could the bondholders help? So I told him I would pass

that along.

And I called Wagner, and Wagner made it clear to me that all of his backstop partners were still in, that they were looking to fund this as soon as possible after the exit from the bankruptcy. So he said, look, we're all still in. It's good. I appreciate their offer, but we don't need their help. We're good to go.

And I said, okay.

So March the 31st voting began on the amended plan. As you know, that voting will continue until May the 15th.

Now, on April the 4th I passed along in

Page 46

Two days later I received a phone call -or an e-mail, rather, from my friend William Jones at Apollo, and he and I had spoken on a number of occasions with respect to opioids. And he said, I hope you and your family are healthy and well. Mind you, this is the start of the coronavirus. And he said, given the market's recent fluctuation, we were hoping to get your thoughts on the PG&E process. Is there a time that works for you to speak this week?

Well, one day later, after the call from Apollo and three days after the call that I got that there was a deal with the Governor and the equity -that deal was actually announced, I think it was on March the 23rd. And there was a story that came out, PG&E reached a deal with the California Governor to emerge from bankruptcy. As it happened, late in Friday on the 20th Governor Newsom put a filing in with the bankruptcy court that said, I support the equity plan and I'm requesting that you the Judge allow it to go to the will of the voters. And so in addition to having the support of the bondholders, the plan now had the support of the Governor's Office.

I did take that call from Apollo on March the 25th. Chris Lahoud, my friend, and I had a nice chat. And, basically, he mentioned that the bondholders Page 48

Page 47

writing Lahoud's thoughts of Wagner to the equity, so

2 they could consider that if any of the backstop parties

3 had any problems, the bondholders could come in and

4 help. They now knew the Governor wanted to help the

5 plan. But, you know, bottom line is he gave me some

6 indication that maybe the funding wouldn't be by August,

7 as we thought. That could blow up the deal. He

8 mentioned something that the CEO of PG&E had said at 9

some investor conference. So I passed that along to 10 Wagner as well. And I said, look, if this thing isn't

11

funded by August 29th, that's a big problem to me, and I don't plan on supporting the deal.

He said, no, the gentleman is just misinformed. It's still our intent to do this as soon

14 15 as we can after we get out of bankruptcy.

So bottom line is is that the bondholders as late as March the 25th called me and offered to help.

18 Wagner made it clear that any concern that the

19 bondholders had that their backstop partners lacked

20 liquidity to do the deal was just false. They had the

21 backstop partners still in the deal, and they were

22 looking to fund as soon as possible. So that was all

23 good news to me, that, No. 1, you had the -- the

24 bondholders wanting to participate again, you had the

25 Governor on board, you had the backstop partners all

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

saying that everything was good to go.

Over the last couple of weeks we've had a series of hearings. We had a hearing in front of Judge Montali on April the 7th, another one on April the 14th. Somebody had asked that the vote be delayed. There was some chatter on social media about that. The Judge said, look, I'm not going to make them delay the vote. I'm not going to send out a letter that says they should.

A week later Judge Montali held a hearing. He approved Justice Jack Trotter as the trustee and Cathy Yanni as the claims administrator.

And then just a couple days ago, on the 16th, Judge Donato conducted a hearing that was very short. Mr. Singleton and I were both on it, but it was really of no significant consequence.

The future hearings, I think we've got one scheduled for the 28th in front of Judge Montali and the 30th with respect to Judge Donato.

Why do I think there is no settlement plan if this one fails? Well, No. 1, the bondholder plan, as Jerry mentioned, the equity and the bondholders reached a deal. It's a contract. The bondholders have agreed to withdraw their plan and to support the equity plan. So contractually they can't do it. No. 2, in the recent

1 Governor supports the equity plan, there is no State

takeover plan. So that leaves this customer-owned

3 utility idea, and I won't beat a dead horse, but for

4 reference, it was filed with the bankruptcy court on

November 24th, 2019, Document No. 306. As Jerry says,

6 it very clearly says we have to find \$59 billion in

capital. And at the time when we investigated that, we

8 learned that to have the 59 billion, they'd never be

9 able to raise it without a State backstop for the

customer-owned utility plan. They never got it.

Governor Newsom never said he wanted it. No action whatsoever in past legislative sessions.

California has a legislative session that starts on May the 5th. There is a bill filing deadline that already passed for this upcoming legislative session, and there is not a single bill that's been filed to provide the backstop for the customer-owned utility idea. Putting it bluntly, the customer-owned utility idea is not a plan. It does not have the funding. And because there has been no bill filed for

June 30, 2020 AB-1054 deadline.

So the customer-owned utility is not a plan. It's a lark. Nobody is considering it. You

don't see the mayor of San Jose coming out for it

it, there is no way to get the funding before the

Page 50

hearing that was held in front of Judge Montali the

bondholders put a filing in that said they support the

3 equity plan and said so in open court on April the 7th.

So at the end of the day there is just no bondholder

5 plan whatsoever.

The second idea that we were looking at last fall was a State takeover plan. And this was in February, I think, Senator Wiener or Wiener, I forget how to pronounce it, announced legislation to take over PG&E. But, interestingly to me, Governor Newsom never came out and said he was in favor of it. I think he used it as a pressure point in his continued negotiation with the equity plan holders, but we knew that as of March the 20th, it's Document No. 6402 in bankruptcy court Case No. 3:19-CV-05257-JD, it was filed by the Governor's Office on March the 20th, and he said, quote,

17 Through these actions and commitments, the debtors 18 evidence their responsiveness to the requirements of

AB-1054 and commitment to financing the improvements

20 necessary to transform PG&E to a safe and reliable

utility. Therefore, the Governor respectfully requeststhe Court enter an order approving the motion or such

23 other relief as the Court deems appropriate, close

24 quote.

So to put that in English, because the

Page 52

Page 51

because he knows the Governor's not for it. You don't see the mayor of Oakland coming out for it because you

3 know he's not for it. I don't see senators or assembly

4 persons from either the Camp Fire area or the Tubbs Fire

area or the other North Bay Fire area. It has zero
 support because the Governor has said he's for the

equity plan.

What does the equity plan have going for it? It's approved by the TCC back on December the 6th and the consenting fire claimant professionals. It's been supported by the bondholders since January 27th of 2020. It's been supported by the Governor's Office since March the 20th of 2020. It's been approved to be voted on by Judge Montali since March of 2020. And since voting has begun, the overwhelming percentage of fire victims who have voted, at least in my firm, are supporting this plan; and we'll get some of those numbers for you at the end of this call.

So that's what I wanted to give you, and I know that's a long answer with a lot of detail. The question is could there be a better settlement option if this plan fails? The answer, in my view, respectfully, is no. If the plan fails, the bankruptcy is going to look a lot more like Enron, which took nine years, where \$78 billion in losses were paid about \$7.8 billion, less

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

than 10 percent, and it took nine years. So that's the -- the very long answer to a question, but I wanted you to have all the detail that you could.

The next question we got is if a structure is destroyed, why is it not just one claim for structural loss and personal property, regardless of the number of occupants?

Elliot, could you take that one?

MR. ADLER: Yeah, sure. So the answer is that different people are the holders of different kinds of claims. So if there are multiple occupants that have lost personal property, each of those occupants will have a claim for the personal property they lost. Likewise, multiple claimants may hold title to real property, so each of those claimants had their claim for their real property loss.

Additionally, there may be some evacuation claim. So if somebody lived at a property and escaped from the fire, they may have an evacuation or emotional distress claim, even though they may or may not have lost any type of property. So each of the occupants within a household will have different types of claims, depending on their situation.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You're muted.

MR. ADLER: That's the answer. It's far

1 the stock that's being traded today in the stock market.

Page 55

Page 56

It is new stock in a new company that will not be

3 saddled with the claims of all the victims, will not be

4 saddled with the claims of all the insurance companies

5 seeking their money back, will not be saddled with the

6 FEMA and the California State claims; and, most

importantly, if we get this plan approved before June

8 and PG&E exits bankruptcy, that NewCo will have access

to all of the State matching funds under 1054 to prevent

any post petition administrative claims from threatening the financial viability of PG&E in such a way that if we

were to delay this vote, the victims might end up with little or nothing, and that's probably the major reason

little or nothing, and that's probably the major reason why I support this plan so strongly.

But the simple answer is no, the victims will not be forced to take stock, and it will be managed by the best professionals that can be hired.

MR. WATTS: All right. Thank you, Rich.

Let me do this: Roy, I want to ask you a question, because I know this is near and dear to your heart, having had your house burned down and then you

built a new one, and, you know, the 2019 fire Kincade

got close. Can you explain what it is the Governor and
 the California Public Utilities Commission have required

the California Public Utilities Commission have required PG&E to do and what steps PG&E has taken to prevent

MR. MILLER: Yeah, I can certainly do

Page 54

less complex than the last question.

MR. WATTS: Thanks, Elliot.

So let me ask you this, Rich. You spend a lot of time investing in the stock market. Does any individual fire survivor have to take their recovery in stock?

MR. BRIDGFORD: Simple answer to that question, Mikal, is no. The stock, as we said before, is going to go to a victims' trust fund, going to be managed by Trotter and Yanni, as you mentioned, and they're going to appoint top flight financial professionals to manage the stock. It's not going to be unloaded. It's not going to be harem-scarem. It's not going to be dumped into the market.

As you mentioned before, the cash portion of the settlement, that cash portion is backstopped. It was in our RSA. That money will be available to pay victims' claims as the process begins and as outlined earlier. The stock does not have to be unloaded, and anybody that says that that might happen is just simply wrong.

The last thing I want to say about this, which is very important, is that, once again, stock that the victims' trust fund will receive, which is about 22.4 percent of equity of PG&E is in NewCo. It's not

these fires from happening again?

that. I know that a lot of people that are listening to this still have some hard feelings towards PG&E. If you went upstairs in my home and asked my wife, Zoe, she's still pissed, and I can't say that I blame her because in some ways I am. But, to be fair, there have been some changes made. Among those is PG&E did support the overhaul of our California Public Utilities Commission, which strengthened PG&E's governance and operations, including more oversight and enforcement. It also had some course correction tools so that the PUC actually has some ability to enforce the rules that they have in place. PG&E also agreed to host an observer to provide the State of California with insight into the company's progress on its safety goals before they enter — or they exit bankruptcy, hopefully at the end of June.

And they agreed that in the unlikely event that the plan is not confirmed or that PG&E does not exit Chapter 11 in a timely manner, they also agreed to an orderly process to sell the business to the State or another party. They agreed not to reinstate a dividend for about three years, which is estimated to add about \$4 billion of equity to help pay down their debt and invest in the grid hardening that people here in Sonoma

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

County, particularly, they can see evidence of that going on right now. That's tree trimming and upgrading of their equipment.

They also are pursuing what's called a rate neutral 7-and-a-half-billion deal -- billion-dollar deal. It's a transaction to reduce the cost of financing for customers and to accelerate payments to all the fire survivors. It's called securitization, which, basically, means they're taking out a mortgage on some of their equipment in order to provide extra money to the deal.

They're also committing not to seek recovery in rate increases for any portion of the about \$25 and a half billion in value that will be paid with respect to the wildfires from '17 and '18. So that includes both the fire survivors and the so-called subrogation, which is the insurance companies.

And previously they also took some steps because AB-1054 that we talked about, it's sort of a shield to protect against future wildfire losses, they have turned over their board of directors. They also brought in a new CEO. He used to be the CEO of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which is the 11th largest public utility in the country. They're pursuing a plan to regionalize their operations, which will make them

Now, what I want to do is I want to switch gears and talk about the stock, and I want to ask four questions -- the fire survivors have asked four questions. I want to get four of them answered before we go on to something else.

And, Rich, you're kind of a guy that I know that's in the market a lot. What's your thought about whether the stock that's being put into the fire victims' trust is worth the suggested 6.75 billion value? Or, more important to me, will it be worth that at the time we have to sell it and start paying claims?

MR. BRIDGFORD: Well, first, of course, I'm not a financial manager. I don't work on Wall Street. I'm a trial attorney. But the stock -- the value of the stock is computed per a complex formula set forth in the disclosure statement in the deal. It's important to know, before the coronavirus, at some time the stock was actually worth more than 6.75; and that since the coronavirus, stock is actually worth more, I believe, than it was at the beginning. I believe it was trading at 9 or something at that time. It's now over 11. But the answer, in fair disclosure, the price of the stock can fluctuate.

But here's a key point: There is a margin of safety that has been built into the stock price here.

Page 58

more responsive and also help in their infrastructure to focus on local communities and customers, because different parts of their grid need different types of upgrades.

They've appointed an independent safety adviser after the term of that the court-appointed federal monitor that's currently in expires. And they're taking on some other oversight actions, including a chief safety expert, this guy named Francisco Benavides. He is a -- has a history in terms of the energy industry, in overseeing employee contractor and public safety. He brings about 30 years of experience to this job. He came from Alcoa, which where he most recently served as VP for environmental health and safety. So he -- he brings a lot to the table.

And these are examples of steps I think
PG&E has taken in a positive way. Now, actions speak
louder than words. I think all of us now have learned a
very, very tough lesson. But the steps are positive,
and with the help of the State actually having some
oversight, I think they're moving in the right
direction.

Thanks, Mikal.

Thanks, Mikal.MR. WATTS: Great, thank you.

Page 60

Page 59

If I had to hazard a guess, I would say this stock will someday trade for significantly more than the 6.75 million. And the reason for that, again, is that the stock we will receive is in a new company. It's not saddled with victims' claims, it's not saddled with the insurance claims, it's not saddled with the FEMA and California state claims. And, most importantly, if this plan gets approved, it will have access to the State 1054 money to remediate those future fires so that the company's financial viability is not threatened.

So why take stock? A lot of people have asked that. The reason that we're taking stock, in my opinion, is that unlike the insurance plans, which were steeply discounted, here we received 6.75 million in cash in -- and there is only so much cash in a bankruptcy with impaired claims to go around. We received 6.75 billion in cash to begin paying victims immediately from the victims' trust fund and its backstop, so that we can't lose that money. The stock and whatever risk there is going forward is the price that we have paid, because we're unwilling to take the steep discounts that other creditor groups have taken. The stock is gravy relative to the discounts those other creditor groups took, in my opinion.

And I believe that it will work out well

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

for us going forward. I don't have a crystal ball and,
as I said, I'm not a financial analyst, but a lot of
people have looked at this and there is a lot of people
on Wall Street that are opining right now that the stock
is at a significant discount to the value of this
company and that PG&E, once you get rid of all of these

2.0

company and that PG&E, once you get rid of all of these claims and it's discharged from the bankruptcy, get rid of all those creditor claims, that PG&E has a virtual monopoly and it's a cash cow, it's a slot machine that produces money month after month and year after year.

MR. WATTS: So let me ask you this, Jim Frantz: What is your understanding as to when the stock's going to be liquidated?

MR. FRANTZ: Okay. That's a good question, Mikal. During the course of the settlement process we'll be utilizing cash to pay all settlements at such time as our experts, our financial experts, determine that stock should be sold, they will be selling stock along the way at the opportune times, and that'll be also utilized to pay claims. So that's going to be kind of a fluid process, from what I understand, and as we've all had with the financial experts.

MR. WATTS: Great. Thank you, Jim.

Let me just throw in two cents about that.

The important thing is the lawyers that are on this and

liquidated in early 2021 as it's needed to pay the claims. In other words, we'll spend the cash during the second half of 2020. Because, remember, it's going to take six months or -- maybe six months. I don't know what the trustee is going to say for everybody to fill out their claims.

So when we need it, we'll liquidate the stock. We'll also take advantage of the stock will be priced at a multiple of earnings, and those earnings will be based on 2022 earnings where the company is going to make money as opposed to 2021 where it's still absorbing the cost of this settlement.

But, again, it's important for everybody to understand, nobody on this call is a stock professional, but we're smart enough to hire them and that's the difference. So you shouldn't take our advice about whether a stock is going to go up or down. I'm not giving that representation. I don't think anybody else here is. But I can look at what the stock was trading at before these fires, where it went last July after AB-1054, and that tells me a lot.

Given the historical trading levels of this stock, other companies are trading as part of what's called the utility index. And as has been said, PG&E has very predictable cash flows in the form of

Page 62

the clients are not going to be asked to make these decisions. We've hired very sophisticated investment

3 bankers. I know that the Tort Claims Committee has

4 hired the Royal Bank of Canada, financial division, a

5 gentleman by the name of Mark Cohen. The trust itself

has hired Houlihan Lokey, which is a very prominent

investment banking advisory firm. That's because,

obviously, if you sell several hundred million shares in

one day, that's going to tank the stock value. So we

have Wall Street experts advising the trustee and the

TCC as to when they should be sold.

The trustee is not going to have, as Jim just said, have to "litigate" anything anytime soon because there's going to be cash on hand as soon as it's funded

We're in the process of negotiating that shareholder rights agreement that you heard about.

Mr. Cohen from RBC is negotiating on our behalf against JPMorgan and Goldman Sachs on the company's behalf. There's already been meetings. My understanding is that this agreement will place limits on how soon or the

amounts of stock that can be sold in order to prevent

devaluation. It'll have antidilution provisions. But if I had to guess, my best guess is the stock is going

to be held by the trust for at least 180 days and then

Page 64

Page 63

17 million customers paying it monthly, and so that's --

2 that's a reassuring thing. But nobody can ensure the

3 future performance of a stock. My gut says we get it in

4 the midst of an economic recession caused by coronavirus

5 and we come back out, it should be in good shape. But

6 talk to your own financial professionals and evaluate

what the stock is going to do on your own, not from

lawyers who are not stock professionals.
 Let me ask you this. Jim: Is ev

Let me ask you this, Jim: Is everyone going to get the same amount of money, regardless of their loss?

MR. FRANTZ: No, they are not. I was involved with the 2007 wildfire litigation in San Diego, and we had -- I want to point this out. We had Justice John Trotter set up our coalition of judges that were mediating the cases. He arbitrated them. And he did a hell of a great job, and I'm really, really proud that we have him handling the -- the cases in this along with Yanni. I mean, I think they'll do a great job.

But every case is unique. Every one is totally unique. This is not a class action. Somebody might have a 400,000-dollar underinsurance claim on their house. Another one might have a zero underinsurance claim, whereby their carrier paid all of their -- all what they needed to rebuild. Someone else

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 67 1

might have a million and a half worth of personal property in some rare cars and whatever, and someone else might have a hundred thousand. So every case is different and we evaluate every one separately and we prepare demand packages for every client separately.

And all my clients that are listening in know that, I always beat the drum at the meetings, that your cases are individualized. It's important that you know that. No one is going to get the same amount of money, and the case stands on its own merits.

The other thing is with the wrongful death claimants, those are unique as well and we talked about those with Justice Trotter and Yanni and those are very specialized and we'll be giving them special treatment.

But, no, every case is separate, every case stands on its own.

MR. WATTS: Okay, great. So Jim was just talking about, you know, the amount of money and when -when people can expect it.

Jerry, what -- what are the financial risks in continuing to fight for more money?

MR. FRANTZ: Well, I can think of at least six financial risks that come to mind. If, for example, we were to reject this deal and we went back to square one, the amount of all of the different claims would go bondholders, and this is something we talked about earlier when we talked about the RSA, that would also go away. And so what they agreed to accept would go up by at least a billion dollars and probably closer to \$2 billion.

In terms of what's going to happen with PG&E and AB-1054, if we do not accept this plan, then the June 30th deadline is just not going to be met. There is absolutely no way that we can get another plan approved by the Court and accepted by everyone involved, including the fire victims by June 30. So if that doesn't happen, then AB-1054 is not going to be viable, and PG&E cannot access that 21-billion-dollar fund. And this is something that was touched on a little bit earlier, but it's an important thing to remember.

Right now all of our interests are tied together. All of us want the stock in PG&E to continue to go up so that the 6.75 billion in stock is worth that amount or more. If PG&E does not have access to the AB-1054 money, then there is no way they're going to be able to raise the capital they need, and any future fire damages would have to be paid out of PG&E's assets, which, essentially, would bankrupt them not as a Chapter 11, which is what we're in now, a reorganization, but a Chapter 7, which is where they

Page 66

Page 68

up.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

One of the things that separates our deal from the individual victims from the other groups, the subrogating insurers, the individual governmental entities, is that they took huge discounts; whereas, we did not. For example, the insurance companies had claims of almost \$20 billion, and they settled for 11, which is less than 60 percent. So if we go back to square one and start over again, that \$9 billion that they're entitled to assert comes back into play.

The second that is very important in terms of the major claims are from FEMA. One of the things that we were the happiest about in terms of how we were able to get this overall deal worked out is that FEMA agreed to entirely subordinate their 3.9-billion-dollar claim to the claims of the individual victims. That means unless every single fire victim is paid 100 cents on the dollar, FEMA cannot recover a penny.

In addition, they agreed to release the State of California and the local entities from \$2.4 billion in claims that the State and local entities had to try and recover on FEMA's behalf. If this plan is not approved, then none of those survive, and, again, we go back to square one.

In terms of the deals with the

would simply be, essentially, for lack of a better term,

1 2 so long apart. What happens, and this is the 3 contingency plan that has been put into effect, is that 4 PG&E is going to be put up for sale by a transition 5 officer, and that person is going to go through and sell

every asset that PG&E has.

So based on all those things, I just don't think it makes sense for either us to vote no or to try and renegotiate the deal that already exists, which would allow all the backstop partners -- and Mikal talked a lot about who they are and their importance, but, essentially, they're the ones that are funding this deal. While the main equity people have a lot of money and are able to put billions into it, this deal requires \$59 billion in financing, and that is based upon the risk analysis assessment that has been done by all these Wall Street firms based upon the deal that's been struck.

If we violate that deal and if we try and get, for example, more cash from PG&E or we try to get them to agree to guarantee the stock, two things that have been talked about on-line, then what happens is the backstop partners have a right to pull out because that's not the deal that they agreed to; and if that happens, this deal goes away and then we're back to a

17 (Pages 65 to 68)

1

2

4

6

four- to five-year process in which people will be paid, we don't know for sure, but it's going to be if not pennies on the dollar, certainly a small percentage of what they would get if a plan is approved.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So those are the -- the reasons why we don't think it makes sense either to reject the deal or to try to renegotiate it.

MR. WATTS: Okay. Elliot Adler, why are there -- why are there 80,000 claims when there is fewer than 30,000 structures that burned down in these fires? And then I'll let Joe follow up with you.

MR. ADLER: Yeah, so there -- there are actually a few different reasons for this. First, there are -- there are multiple individual claims per household. So, for example, a family of four who lost their home, that's going to be four separate claims. Also, if there is a rental property that burned down, both the owner and the renter will have separate claims. Secondly, we understand that some law firms double-filed their claims and their cases. The reason for this is that there was some fear early on that the on-line filing system would fail. So in an abundance of caution the same claims were filed twice by some law firms, and

this led to thousands of duplicate filings, which are

now being eliminated from the system.

is -- has downloaded every one of those claims, has

translated it all so he can read it and he can actually

3 compare. And what he looks for is duplicate clients for

the same claim being represented by multiple attorneys.

5 That's very -- much more common than we had thought.

What's going to have to happen is now those are going to

7 have to be sorted out. And the people -- many of you,

8 though, if you're multiply represented, you probably

9 know that at this point, as you've undoubtedly received

10 communications from more than one law firm. That's

11 going to have to get resolved. You're going to have to

12 decide who it is that's going to prosecute your claim

13 for you in this process. So please keep aware of that.

14 And only -- you only get one vote. Even if you voted

15 twice through two different firms, that's going to be --

16 one of your votes is going to get negotiated. So please

17 pay attention to that, in terms of us going forward to 18 actually work up your claims. Only one law firm can do

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I keep getting these questions about why are we in such a hurry to vote. That's such a big thing for a lot of people. They want us to wait. They want to -- let's wait until May 1st, let's wait until later. That's something I really want to address, because it surprised the heck out of me, because I have talked to

Page 70

Third, there are some individuals that filed their claims multiple times even without law firms. So this was also probably due to the same lack of familiarity with the on-line filing system. And in abundance of caution, the same claims were filed twice or I've heard up to six times in some cases, and those claims would likely be -- the other ones are now being eliminated from the system.

Also, some -- some people filed evacuation claims or other claims that didn't have to do with burned structures. People who don't have property loss, but who fled from the fire, for example, may have a claim for emotional distress or something unrelated to real property damage. So even though there may have been fewer than 30,000 structures that burned, there are many more people that will have viable claims.

> MR. WATTS: Okay. Elliot, thank you. Joe, what -- what would you like to add to

that?

MR. EARLEY: Yeah, what I'd like to add -thank you, Mikal, for that opportunity -- this claims group -- the group of claims that are filed with Prime Clerk right now is really no indication that -- that 80,000 is no indication. Let me tell you why I know that for sure, is my office, an associate in my office

Page 72

Page 71

so many clients. Everyone wants to get the voting out

2 of the way. They wish -- they wish the voting, you 3 know, period was one week rather than six weeks. And I

4 know six weeks seems like a long time, but you got to

5 remember that, you know, who -- Mikal Watts deals with

6 these huge quantities of clients, and in order to

7 actually effectuate anything, it's a big process. This 8

is not like a -- in the normal circumstances.

So we want everyone to have the opportunity to vote, so he get -- we -- on day one we send out our -- our ballots so people could vote. You have that opportunity. And we got accused of pushing people to get their vote in too soon. Mikal has talked to me about this thing called the rule of threes, where a third of the people in any large quantity are going to do something right away, a third of them are going to need a little bit of nudging and -- and help, and then the final third is the one that takes the longest time. And that's what we're really concerned about, because no matter when we get started, there is always going to be some people at the end. We really want everyone to vote and don't want anyone to miss that opportunity.

People are scattered all over the place. It's very difficult to do. So we want to minimize that. We have a duty to represent every one of our clients.

18 (Pages 69 to 72)

So everyone needs the opportunity to vote. So while it seems like we're pressuring and keep texting and e-mailing and doing all this to get people to vote, it's because we want everyone to do it. We apologize that it seems untoward. That's the -- that's the reality in this kind of situation.

So the question really is -- it really is why -- you know, why are you -- why not wait? The question is why wait? It makes really no sense. I look at this as a -- a client of mine is standing in the road and there is a -- there is a car bearing down on them at a high rate of speed. They have two choices, you know, they can get out of the way as soon as possible or -- or they can wait and see what happens. Maybe -- maybe there'll be a better outcome or something. But as their -- as their fiduciary I say, get out of the road now. There is no reason to wait. There is many reasons why you could be harmed if you don't get out of the way right now, and I see that as very similar. We don't have an alternative. Just get out of the way of the car because there is a -- there is a downside, as Jerry was explaining, to not doing this.

I know that -- and it's overwhelmingly in support of it. Using that car analogy, when you're driving down the road at night and you see all the

behind. We want you to exercise that vote at the time you're ready. Hopefully, after long meetings like this, you get the information to make you comfortable.

But speaking of comfortable, Roy Miller, you're on -- you're a fire survivor as well as a lawyer. Are there any secret provisions or trapdoors that aren't in the deal, anything that's not aboveboard, as far as you're concerned as a fire survivor and a lawyer that's read the documents?

MR. MILLER: This is an issue that's come up in some questions I've had for my clients. It's come up a lot in chatter on social media. And I'm not going to say it's like a conspiracy theory, but it doesn't make a lot of sense and there is a reason for that, because lawyers have an absolute obligation to disclose everything to you. So you got as part of your ballot packet, either by text or e-mail for our group, a disclosure statement, and you're getting a ton of information. I know that it's complex. I know at times it may seem overwhelming. But we are required to give you all of the information regarding what is happening in this case. And the disclosure statement is what the Court approved to provide to you.

There are no side deals. There are no unknown provisions. Everything regarding this

Page 74

headlights coming toward you, there is a very good chance that you're going in the wrong direction. So you might want to think about turning around. There is a reason why there is all this intense and overwhelming support for this plan.

So thank you for that.

MR. WATTS: Yeah, you know, I'll just throw in one other thing. That is that it's our job to get you as much information as we can. So, again, I've worked really hard with -- with Joe and with Roy on these weekly telephonic town halls and our friends Jim, and Rich, Jerry, and Elliot have listened to several of them, because we had talked about doing this together, and we'll continue to try to get the information out.

But, to be clear, I don't want anybody voting that's not ready to vote. If that day is May 15th, it's May 15th. But we're not going to wait until May 15th to get you the information that you need. We're going to continue to have these meetings so that you can make sure you get your vote in. We would encourage, you know, that, obviously, this is something that we helped negotiate. We're in favor of it. We recommend it to you. But it's your vote. It's your individual vote. It's not your lawyer's vote. So we

want you to exercise that vote so you're not left

Page 76

Page 75

settlement is in writing. It's transparent because it has to be. Whether you were involved in being run over in a crosswalk or you were involved in a mass tort, in

in a crosswalk or you were involved in a mass tort, in
 California you must be told all the ins and outs of the

settlement, including risks if you do not accept the

6 settlement. So everything that you need to make your

decision regarding your vote is in the disclosure
 documents. All of us that are on this call, all of your

documents. All of us that are on this call, all of your lawyers are also available to answer questions via phone and e-mail. We have done so. We'll continue to do so.

and e-mail. We have done so. We'll continue to do so.
 But everything regarding this case is in the disclosure
 statements.

MR. WATTS: Great. Thank you.

Joe, if somebody wants to get more information about the settlement than what's in the disclosure statement, where can they go?

MR. EARLEY: So with my clients, you know, here in the -- in the Camp -- for the Camp Fire, you know, every week we send out an update and we direct people where to go and inform them about different issues. I understand that Roy is doing that as well for the North -- for the -- in the North Bay fires. But for everybody else, you can ask your lawyer the questions. I'm not representing people, I'm not representing -- I can't give advice to that, but your lawyers are, if you

19 (Pages 73 to 76)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

one?

have a lawyer. If you're someone who's unrepresented, you know, there is a lot of information. We put out on

a public website, firesettlementfacts.com. It's a very

good source. Mikal is really good at unloading

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

information for that or onto that site so you can find out all kinds of stuff. You can read for the rest of your life on that, if you want to. And that's where I

9 any further questions. But they can always ask us.

> For our clients we have the chico@wattsguerra.com e-mail address and the -- in North Bay we have the santarosa@wattsguerra.com. You can always ask any questions there. They will be answered within a few days, anyway, and oftentimes right away.

probably recommend even our clients to go if they have

So I know I feel good about answering the questions. I hope that everyone is doing that for their clients as well. But firesettlementfacts.com is really the place to go to -- to ask questions and to have them

MR. WATTS: So, you know, generally, I think it's a hierarchy of information. You got to start with the disclosure statement. That's the Court approved, neutral language that everybody had the right to be heard about. Read the disclosure statement. If you're voting via text, on the text you're going to have

Page 79 MR. ROECKER: Great. I think the first

question is from Kevin. Kevin wants to know what happens with the value of his property now. He lost two homes. He wants to know if he'll be compensated for the

loss in property value. MR. WATTS: Jerry, do you want to take that one?

MR. SINGLETON: Sure, I'll be happy to. The answer is it depends. There are two different ways that you can calculate the value of the damages. If you have sold your property or if you have an absolute intent not to rebuild, then you're compensated exactly as you suggested, by determining what the diminution in the fair market value of your property is. So you would look at the property the day before. You'd look at the property the day after the fire. You would subtract the difference, and that would

be the amount of the loss.

However, the -- the better way to calculate it for the -- from the victim's perspective or the survivor's perspective is to look at what it would cost to repair everything on the property that was damaged. So we're talking about not just rebuilding the home, but also rebuilding any outbuildings, replacing the trees, replacing the landscaping, fixing erosion

Page 78

1 problems. And there has been some wonderful law in the 2

Page 80

that. If you're voting via e-mail, you're going to have that in an e-mail format. And if you got paper ballots, you're going to have that paper content.

In addition, I think everybody on this -this line, lawyer-wise, has sent out a letter in support together with what's called the solicitation materials. That was something that we all agreed to do as part of the Restructure Support Agreement, and I believe we've all done that.

And then, lastly, e-mail your own lawyers. It wouldn't be appropriate for somebody represented by Jerry to be e-mailing me or somebody from Rich to be e-mailing, you know, Roy or something like that. E-mail your own lawyers and then get the information from them and then, obviously, rely on your own common sense.

All right. So we've been going for about an hour and 52 minutes, but I have just procured another 30 minutes so that we can get a lot of your questions. So we're going to switch gears and go to your questions right now. So, remember, what you do is you push star 3. Sam Roeker, who is our moderator, will give us the easy questions that the seven of us will endeavor to answer.

24 So, Sam, let's go ahead and start with 25 questions that have been sent out.

California appellate courts over the last three decades that recognizes that property damages are unique and property is not fungible. We have an attachment to our land, and we want to repair the land and put it back in the condition it was in. And so the courts will allow you to recover far more than the prefire value of the property if you actually intend to make those repairs.

So that's something you obviously have to discuss with your attorney, but, again, there are those two different ways of doing it. The one is the cost of cure, in which you can recover more than the prefire value of the property, and then the diminution in value, in which you're looking, as you said, at just the amount that your property depreciated in value.

MR. WATTS: Thank you, Jerry. Sam, who's got the next question? MR. ROECKER: Yeah, Eugene had to drive through flames and smoke. What does he have to do to prove that he did that and what he lost?

MR. WATTS: Joe, you want to take that

23 MR. EARLEY: Sure.

24 For most people that had to go through 25 what he went through, usually there is going to have

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

been an insurance claim that was made. So anything you exchanged with your insurance company, we want to have. And if you spent more on repairing, whether it be an automobile or a home or replacing a home and you got insurance money, that difference is the structure portion of your claim. It's the same thing if you lost everything inside your home. If it cost you more to replace the things in your home than the insurance covered, then that's part of your claim as well.

If you have pictures of your home or your car or your property before the fire, we would appreciate having that.

We will utilize commercial satellite photography to take after pictures from space, but many of you have also sent us pictures of your after photos of your property. I did that for mine as well.

So photos, documents you exchanged with your insurance company, including contents lists, those are the sorts of things that we need. What we'll be doing is going through all of our files this summer. If there are any additional things we need, we'll reach out to you and meet with you to get them together before your claim gets submitted.

Thank you.

2.0

25 MR. WATTS: All right. Sam, who's next?

MR. WATTS: So let me answer that one, and then I'll pass these future questions off to others. So under the bankruptcy code, I think it's 11 U.S.C. 1126, if I'm not mistaken, or may be 1256. I'm not -- anyway, the bankruptcy code requires that in order for a plan to be accepted by the class of creditors, that would be you the fire survivors, you got to have two-thirds in value and one half of the claimants. And so, in effect, we're looking to get two-thirds of the claimants because, you know, a lot of folks filed their claims without the value in there, so the Judge is just kind of saying, hey, we're going to do it on a per-head basis. So we need two-thirds of the people who filed notices of claims as of last December 31st, two-thirds of the people who vote need to vote yes for this plan to pass. MR. ROECKER: Okay. Our next one is from,

MR. ROECKER: Okay. Our next one is from it looks like Jay. He wants to know, are the pay-outs going to be in chronological order depending on the order and dates of the fires?

MR. WATTS: Why don't we use Rich Bridgford for this one. You were in San Diego. Is there any relationship between earliest fires go first? I haven't seen anything like that. Have you?

 $\label{eq:mr.def} MR.\ BRIDGFORD:\ Sorry,\ I\ was\ on\ mute$ there.

Page 82

By the way, we have about 34 minutes left. So, again, go to star 3 and enter your question. We'll try to reach as many of them as we can. We just bought an extra half an hour of time on this phone line. So we want to stay and answer as many questions as we can.

Who's next, Sam?

MR. ROECKER: Yeah, Forrest has already voted to accept. He wants to know what to do next. Are there any other steps he needs to complete?

MR. WATTS: Well, I think if -- Forrest, if you're for it and you want to get paid, you should get all your old neighbors, make sure they cast their vote as well. It's not a whole lot different than, you know, a political situation. Nobody else votes, you can get outvoted. So if you and your neighbors are all of one mind and you'd like to see this plan go through, I'd pull out the old Rolodex of neighbors and colleagues and people in the same situation and -- and -- and advocate with them, just community activism. Tell them why you're for it and make sure they vote.

And then go ahead.

MR. ROECKER: Karen has a similar question. Karen is ready to call people and ask them to vote yes, too, but she also wants to know what the magic number of yes votes is that are needed.

Page 84

Page 83

I haven't seen anything that would suggest that it's going to be based upon a chronological occurrence of the fires. I think it's going to be based upon getting your claims ready and getting them submitted.

MR. WATTS: Okay. Sam, next question.
MR. ROECKER: Yeah, a similar one from
Trinity. She said, how are pay-outs being handled to
make sure everyone gets a piece of claims that are
submitted at different times? So is there any different
answer for that question?

MR. WATTS: Jerry, you've been in a lot of these meetings with trustee John Trotter and special master Cathy Yanni. Why don't you take that one.

MR. SINGLETON: Sure. So that's a good question. A lot of people have asked that. And it's important to remember that the trustee has a fiduciary duty to every single one of the roughly 77,000 claimants out there. And while we believe that the 13.5 billion is going to be enough to pay everyone 100 cents on the dollar of the approved value of their claims, we can't guarantee that.

So what's going to happen is the trustee is going to hold back a certain amount until he is sure that he can pay out all of the claims. So, for example,

21 (Pages 81 to 84)

Page 85 Page 87

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

12

13

14

15

16

17

- 1 if the trustee holds back 20 percent and your approved 2 claim was 500,000, he would issue you a check for
- 3 400,000, and then that remaining 100,000, the
 - 20 percent, would be withheld until he can determine
- 5 that there is enough money to pay everybody. If --
- 6 again, we hope this doesn't happen. But if it turns out
- 7 that there is only enough to pay everyone 90 cents on
- 8 the dollar or 95 cents on the dollar, he will then
- 9 pay -- once everyone is paid out and once that amount is
- determined, he will then give you the balance. And that way if it does have to be reduced, then everyone's is
- way if it does have to be reduced, then everyone's is reduced by 5 percent as opposed to there being enough at

the beginning, but not enough at the end.

MR. WATTS: Yeah, I think Jerry got that right. I mean, unlike these SBA loans for the \$350 billion is already spoken for, handed out in sequence of your application, I don't think the trusts are going to be run that way. I think there will be pro rata reductions.

Sam, what's -- what's next?

MR. ROECKER: Yeah, actually, we have Peter. Peter is a renter. He wants to know how the settlement takes into account renters instead of

25 MR. WATTS: Sure. Roy, you want to take

as possible. But my sense -- and Mikal or any of the other people, if you have a different sense, please let everyone know. But my sense is they're going to encourage people to do it as quickly as possible, and they're going to try to make sure everything is wrapped up within the year 2021. But if there are extraordinary circumstances and some can't be done, I think they're going to be lenient about that because the goal is to make sure that all the victims are fully compensated.

MR. WATTS: Yeah, and I -- I would say that, you know, the cash comes in three tranches: 5.4 billion whenever we get to the effective date and then 650 million on January the 15th of 2021 and there is a final tranche of 700 million on January the 15th of 2022. I think that would be the outer edge of the final payments.

But I talked to Justice Trotter and Cathy Yanni, and I know it's their goal to push out as much money as they can by year-end 2020 and then certainly after a bunch of the stock is liquidated in early 2021. That's their goal in hiring hundreds of people to try and get that done.

You know, there was a little bit of questioning about, hey, the Judge just approved \$19 million in trust claim, you know, expenses. That

Page 86

Page 88

that?

homeowners.

4

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

15

16

18

19

20

24

25

MR. MILLER: Sure thing. So a renter is going to be considered the same as a homeowner. It doesn't make any difference if you're one or the other.

The only difference between a renter claim and a

homeowner claim is the homeowner has a structure portion of their claim, the renter does not. But your contents

8 listing is going to be the same. Your emotional

9 distress component is still the same. If you, like me

and my family, fled from the fire, there is going to be an emotional distress component regardless of whether

12 you're a renter or a homeowner, because a lot of our

clients are renters and they have come into the process
suming there are second-class citizens and they're

not. They're equal. The only difference is they don't have a structure portion of their claim because they

didn't own their home.

Thanks, Mikal.

MR. WATTS: All right. Sam, whose next?

MR. ROECKER: Dan wants to know if there

is a firm deadline for all the claims to be finalized.

MR. SINGLETON: There isn't yet. They've talked -- by "they" I mean the trustee and the claims

administrator. They've talked about instituting one because they obviously want to get this done as quickly seems like a lot. The bottom line is we have a choice.

We can -- we can do it small time and it'll take forever

3 or we can hire a whole bunch of people and process the

claims as quickly as we can and get you paid quicker.
 That \$19 million, while it is a significant amount of

6 money, the interest on the \$5.4 billion in cash will

7 more than cover it. Now, we've been told to expect

8 about 1.025 percent interest a year. When you do the

9 math, the idea in these big mass tort claims

administrations typically have it where the interest is going to take care of the claims administration costs.

going to take care of the claims administration costs.

MR. ROECKER: Looks like Carol has a

question about her daughter. Her daughter lost all her possessions in the fire, but is not signed up. Is there any way for her to still get compensated?

 $\label{eq:MR.WATTS: Joe, you want to take that one?} MR. WATTS: Joe, you want to take that$

MR. EARLEY: Sure. It really depends on
whether your daughter is a minor or not, because minors
are not allowed to own anything, so you own them for
them and you can make the claim as part of -- part of
your claim. That's the normal procedure. My daughter
lost everything as well, but she happened to be beyond
the age of majority, so she has her own individual

25 claim.

22 (Pages 85 to 88)

Page 89 Page 91 MR. MILLER: All right. The short answer MR. WATTS: There you go. 1 2 2 is yes, if you wound up in the hospital related to What's next, Sam? 3 MR. ROECKER: Next, we've got Barbara. 3 fleeing the fire -- and I have a number of clients who 4 Barbara wants to know if she is able to cash in on the 4 were injured in -- in running away from the fire, 5 shares of stock that she receives, if she chooses that 5 received medical care, some of them received counseling 6 option. And, overall, what -- what good is the stock? 6 or mental healthcare. Get the billings to your 7 7 MR. WATTS: Rich, why don't you take that attorney. Most -- all of our attorneys should have the 8 8 ability to have you sign a waiver so they can get the one. 9 9 records directly from your medical provider, and then we Rich, you're on mute. 10 MR. BRIDGFORD: Can I have that repeated, 10 can have our experts look over it. The short answer is 11 Sam? 11 yes, but we just need to have that proof. So get ahold 12 12 MR. ROECKER: Yeah. Barbara wants to know of your lawyer. Get the forms signed so they can get 13 13 the records to be part of your claim. if she is able to cash in the shares of stock once she 14 receives them. 14 Thanks, Mikal. 15 MR. BRIDGFORD: The stock is going to a 15 MR. ROECKER: I think we have Arlene. 16 16 They have two houses claimed. She just wants to know, victims' trust fund. She's not receiving the stock 17 directly, is, I believe, the correct answer to that. 17 are there two votes? They've only had one e-mail text 18 Although the agreement that Mikal mentioned earlier has 18 so far, but do they vote twice because they have two 19 19 not been completely finalized. 20 Mikal, do you want to chime in on that at 20 MR. MILLER: Mikal, you're on mute. 21 all? 21 MR. WATTS: I'll answer that one. If you 22 MR. WATTS: I think that's right. I think 22 filed two proofs of claims, you need to file two votes 23 the goal is any stock taken by the trust is going to be 23 to have both of your votes count. So if you filed one 24 managed by an investment banker and liquidated by the 24 for one house and one for another, then you're going to 25 investment banker. At one time there was some 25 have two votes. If you filed one claim and just had Page 90 Page 92 1 discussion about individuals having the option to take 1 everything put together, you're probably going to have 2 the stock. That -- whether that's going to take place 2 one claim. But match up the number of proofs of claim 3 or not has not been finalized. But the vast majority of 3 that you did when you put in your proofs of claim last 4 4 the stock is going to be liquidated by the investment 5 bankers so that we have the cash to pay the fire 5 Sam. what's next? 6 survivors, who, after all, lots of the survivors need 6 MR. ROECKER: Linda had to sell her 7 that money to rebuild their houses. 7 property. She should -- she said -- yeah, she says she 8 I think one of the common positions that 8 had to sell her property. She should have as much money 9 9 everybody on this call has is it's our goal to get you as someone who is choosing to rebuild. Is there any 10 money, you know, this year, early next year. The 10 advice on that for her claim? 11 MR. WATTS: Jerry, you want to take that 11 consequences of voting no means a lot of litigation, and 12 it becomes one of these nine-year ordeals like what 12 one? 13 happened in the Enron situation. 13 MR. SINGLETON: Yeah. Again, the problem 14 So that's kind of what we're working on, 14 there -- and I completely understand what she's saying 15 is getting the cash out as quickly as we can so you-all 15 in terms of just a basic fairness standpoint. But the 16 can rebuild your homes. 16 problem has to do with the way that damages are 17 What's next, Sam? 17 calculated from a legal perspective, and the standard MR. ROECKER: Yeah, Frank and his wife had 18 18 way of calculating damages is the diminution in value. 19 to flee from the fire. They were in a shelter where 19 So, again, if her property was worth 750,000 the day 20 2.0 they got sick. That led to some hospital bills and before the fire and then afterward it was worth a hundred thousand, then her loss is 650,000. 21 other injuries. Are they able to claim all of those 21 22 costs including the pain and suffering as part of their 22 There is an exception in the law that 23 23 claim? allows people who have an actual intent to rebuild to go 24 MR. WATTS: Roy, why don't you take that, 24 over and above that diminution in value and even over

23 (Pages 89 to 92)

and above what it would -- what the property would have

25

25

hospital bills and pain and suffering.

been worth prior to the fire if they have an actual intent to rebuild. But the problem is if you've sold your property or if you do not have an intent to rebuild, then, unfortunately, under California law you're limited to diminution in fair market value.

have dividends.

MR. ROECKER: Next question, (inaudible) wants to know if for some reason somebody with a claim doesn't survive, doesn't make it until the claims process is finalized, what happens to their compensation?

MR. WATTS: Jerry, do you want to take that one as well?

MR. SINGLETON: Sure. The answer is that it depends. If you -- if the person passes away of natural causes that are unrelated to any injuries that they sustained during the fire, then what would happen is that their economic damages, so any damages to real property, personal property, anything like that would survive; but their noneconomic damages, their pain and suffering, the emotional distress that they felt running from the fire, all of those would not survive.

Unfortunately, those are extinguished with the death of

Now, the only exception to that is if someone were to suffer injuries in the fire, which,

the person, under California law.

MR. WATTS: Yeah, I think -- I think part of the Governor's deal was from the time they exit, they can't pay dividends for three years, because what the Governor -- what the Governor was trying very hard to do was to make sure that they didn't pay a bunch of dividends and take dollars that they needed in order to do what's called grid hardening to prevent future fires, but to do it in such a way that it wasn't getting passed up to the rate payer.

So the Governor drew a really hard bargain trying to make this as rate neutral as possible on the California rate payer. And so, as I understand it, there will be no dividends on this stock for three years. Unfortunately, that's going to apply to the stock that any individual would take, whether or not, you know, if you -- if you could take it from the trust, which I don't think is going to be likely, or the trust, for that matter, does not get dividends, either. It's just one class of stock. Nobody is getting dividends because the money that used to go to dividends is now going to go to hardening the grid, preventing future fires.

We've got about 16 minutes left. If you have any questions, please get on star 3 and type them in, and we'll go from there.

Page 94

unfortunately, there were some people who were significantly injured and then passed away as much as a year later due to the lingering effects, smoke inhalation, things like that, if that happens, then they could make a wrongful death claim. But those are very rare circumstances. Generally, what happens is you're talking about people who, unfortunately, pass away from natural conditions that are unrelated to the fire, and then the general rule is the noneconomic damages are extinguished, but the economic damages go to their heirs and they can pursue.

MR. WATTS: Okay. Who's next?
MR. ROECKER: Yeah, Rick likes the idea of taking stock, but wants to know if the new stock will

MR. WATTS: Rich, do you want to take that one? Not for three years, right?

 $\label{eq:mr.def} MR.\ BRIDGFORD:\ Let\ me\ \text{---}\ let\ me\ get\ off}$ my mute there.

There is -- there is a time period that I believe there won't be dividends. Mikal, you know what that exact period is. It slips me. But the reality is at some point again the utility stock, I'm sure, will pay a dividend, but they're going to be -- they're going to be busy for a while.

Page 96

Page 95

Sam, who do we have next?

MR. ROECKER: Yeah, we have Sharon as well as a couple others asking similar questions. She wants to know if this goes through and everybody votes yes, when do you think fire survivors will start receiving money?

MR. WATTS: Well, I think I can answer that. I think the goal is, you know, to give fire survivors enough time to file their claims, with all the documentation they'll need in order to, you know, get what they actually lost, the goal would be -- my guess would be, and I'm just guessing, I'm not the trustee, that period will be about six months. Why? Because the investment bankers are telling us that holding the stock for six months is the way to keep its price real high. So if we're getting the price as high as we can by holding it for the appropriate amount of time that the Royal Bank of Canada tells us to hold it for before we begin liquidating, we use the \$5.4 billion we're getting on the effective date to pay the early claims, we're giving people that time period to file their claims at the same time the stock is appreciating, and the sweet spot is the end of the year, January of next year to start liquidating that stock.

MR. ROECKER: Next, we've got Carol.

24 (Pages 93 to 96)

1

4

5

12

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

know if there will be a recording of this call and other 2 calls that we've had previously for people to review. 3

Carol lost her job due to the Tubbs Fire. She wants to know what formula is being used as to how much money is awarded for people like her based on her salary. And she has not found another job since.

MR. WATTS: Yes. Plan on -- plan on going to at least -- if you guys don't mind, my firm's website is www.firesettlementfacts.com. We'll post them there,

MR. WATTS: Roy, do you want to handle that one?

6 but I'll also -- you know, the last few town halls that 7 I've done where Jerry and Rich and Jim and Elliot

MR. MILLER: Sure.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

8 listened in, you know, we're providing a transcript of

What we're waiting on are the final rules from the trustee to establish, basically, the four corners of where an employment loss or a business loss gets decided. Your paycheck stubs will be a starting point. So if you're making 30 bucks an hour or 25 bucks an hour, you have your pay stubs and tax forms and things like that. We'll use that and then apply it to the formula that the trustee will be providing us as to how far out we're allowed to use your lost employment in

9 that. This -- today will be transcribed. It takes a 10 few days because it's on a weekend. But when we get it, 11 we will send it to our clients. We'll also send it to

13 And then I intend to put the transcript up on 14 www.firesettlementfacts.com.

compensating you through the PG&E case. I don't know if it will take it through the entire time period that you're talking about, but we're going to hopefully have a time period from October of 2017 out at least a year, if not better.

MR. ROECKER: Another one that we have on-line, is it possible that the cash part of the settlement will run out and then the only option remaining is stock?

our colleagues here, who can send it to their clients.

All right, thank you.

MR. WATTS: Let me answer that. I was going to give it to Jerry -- and, Jerry, you pile on with me. Jerry and I have been in rooms where the trustee and the claims administrator have done just

MR. ROECKER: Next, we have Monica -yeah, Monica wants to know if two-thirds of the vote comes in prior to May 15th, will voting be over or will yeoman's duty the last four months to, in effect, pre-do the work from the standpoint of what the claims rules are going to look like. We're really far along about

Page 98

Page 100

Page 99

it still go all the way through the 15th?

MR. WATTS: Yeah, let me answer that. I'm methods of delivering the votes. Some law firms did it

pretty sure we're going to go all the way through the 15th. The reason is that that there are different via paper or e-mail straight to Prime Clerk. Others are doing it digitally, like my firm, I know Jerry's firm is and Elliot's firm is, I think Fran's and Bridgford are doing it that way as well. And then they'll deliver that digital total to Prime Clerk.

So, and then, of course, we had a bunch of people that were saying, hey, hold your vote until May. So I just -- I think that we're going to be looking at a vote tally shortly after May 15th. And, you know, that's appropriate. I mean, everybody was -- was told you're going to have until May the 15th to vote. You ought to be able to vote until May 15th. You know, our challenge is to continually get our folks information, because we can make you comfortable enough to exercise your vote before then. Of course, that's safe in terms of getting it in. But if you want to wait until, you know, the first two weeks of May, that's certainly your prerogative. And I think you'll have that right. MR. ROECKER: It looks like Steve has a

couple questions on-line. The first one is he wants to

that. They're finalizing it now. We're trying to accelerate the process so we can get the claims period started, you know, immediately. Some people will do their claims earlier, and we'll get those to BrownGreer. BrownGreer will have time to get those up and running and the like.

My expectation is that we have a gentleman by the name of Eric Kennedy who helps administer a bunch of these sophisticated mass tort settlement trusts. He's one who we call the budget guy. He's got a bunch of algorithms, and he knows exactly how many houses have burned down, how many buildings have burned down, pretty good forestry law stuff, how many people were in the fire zone. So we've got it pretty well modeled out. And if I had to bet on Eric Kennedy, who I know from previous litigation, I don't think he's going to miss. So is there a risk? I suppose so, but it's an educated risk, but I don't think -- it's not been my experience that Eric Kennedy fails at the jobs that we give him.

He's -- he's a very diligent guy. Jerry, you got any thoughts? MR. SINGLETON: Yeah, no, I think that's a

hundred percent correct. When you look at the amount of money, 5.4 billion, and you just think about how long it's going to take to pay all of that out, I think we're

25 (Pages 97 to 100)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 103

going to have a billion, maybe 2 billion left once the trustee starts divesting the stock in January. So while that certainly is a risk, we don't think it's a likely

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. WATTS: Yeah, I agree with Jerry. Okay. So, Sam, let's do a couple more questions, then I'm going to let everybody wrap it up with a closing argument, if you will.

MR. ROECKER: Yeah, first of all, it looks like Sue and Allison, Carl, they also want to say thank you for the call and the information.

Then going back to questions. It looks like Steve wants to know, what's the risk in waiting?

MR. WATTS: Let me answer that. So, obviously, I want to preface this with the -- are you talking about waiting on voting, Steve? Is that -- was that the -- the tenor of the question?

Okay. So here's my thought: I don't want anybody to vote until they are ready to vote, but -- and I'm not going to sit here and slam the United States Postal Service. I've read some articles that Donald Trump doesn't think it ought to be saved. I don't know whether it should be or not, so I'm not going to get into that. But here's what I know: I've done cases in Iowa where it takes a piece of mail that I send from

papers on top of, you just missed the deadline.

I worry a lot about change of address situations. Let me tell you what I mean by that. Statistically, I've had experts that are Post Masters that tell me, on average, a lot of us move several times in our lives; and as a population Americans are not wonderful about filing change of address notifications down at the -- the post office. And so some of those just get lost in the mail because you moved to Arizona and you didn't notify somebody to go there. So your ballot is sitting there waiting in some empty post office box in Santa Rosa or in Paradise or Chico, for that matter. So I worry about that in 2020 paper ballots are just sluggish from the standpoint of getting the responses back.

I like the fact that, you know, a lot of us bank using our smart device. A lot of us calendar using our smart device. A lot of us store, you know, our texts and our e-mails on our smart device. I like the computerized record that is created when you vote via text or e-mail because we know there is a digital record and it's not going to get lost in the mail.

So that's the only concern that I've got about waiting, is that if you're going to vote late and you do it via mail, make sure you get it in the mail in

Page 102

- San Antonio, Texas to rural Iowa eight days to get there. And my concern is is that that piece of mail
- 3 sits on your desk, your spouse comes in and puts a
- 4 folder on top of it, and it gets lost for 20, 30 days.
- 5 You get around to cleaning your desk sometime around May
- 6 the 10th. You diligently vote at that time. You stick
- 7 it in the mail. Maybe it takes the U.S. Postal Service 8
- too long to get it there. You know, I don't even know 9
 - whether the rules are postmarked by the 14th or 15th.

I don't think they're going to wait around for a long time to count votes. Why do I know that? There is an estimation hearing that's scheduled on May 21st in front of Judge Donato. There is also a confirmation hearing on May the 27th in front of Judge Montali. So this is a tight schedule.

And, again, I don't want to overstate the significance here. I think as lawyers wanting to communicate with our clients, we all agree that we want all of our clients to vote their conscience. This is your case. It's not our case. This is the one time when you get to decide what's going to happen, and you get to decide whether you're going to get paid now with a proposal that we think is a good proposal; but it's your right to vote, not ours. It would be unfortunate

if through mail getting lost, through somebody putting

Page 104

time. And read through the disclosure statements and figure out when you need to get it done. And if you want to wait, that's fine. If you want to vote after, you know, what's becoming a two-and-a-half-hour informational town hall, that's fine as well.

So we've got about six minutes left. Let's take one more question. Then I want to hold five minutes for the end.

MR. ROECKER: Yeah, it looks like our last question is from Mark. Mark wants to know if our payments will come in installments or one lump sum.

MR. WATTS: Jerry, you want to take that

MR. SINGLETON: Sure. I think, in all likelihood, there is going to be two installments. What'll happen is once you submit a claim, then the claims administrator will work with your attorney; and that claim will be finalized, meaning that they'll come up with a final number that everybody agrees upon. Earlier I think it was either Roy or Joe that went through the process of how that happens.

Once that happens, then in all likelihood, there will be a check that will be issued for about 80 percent of that. It might be a little more or a little less. But the purpose of that is to make sure

26 (Pages 101 to 104)

that if, worst-case scenario, there isn't enough to pay everyone a hundred cents on the dollar and we can only pay 90 cents, they want to make sure that that is done evenly and that everyone gets 90 percent as opposed to some people getting a hundred and some people getting

So the way we anticipate it's going to work is that once your claim is finalized, you'll get a check for the lion's share, probably around 80 percent. And then once the trustee determines there is enough money to pay everyone a hundred cents on the dollar, then he will issue the remaining amount.

MR. WATTS: Great. So we got about four minutes left. So before we open it up to the lawyers to finish their comments by our deadline at 2:30 -- or at -- yeah, at 2:30, I want to thank all of our clients and anybody else that attended. This is designed to be an open forum. The different lawyers that are here thought it good that we get as much information out as we can. I can tell you that for a significant period of time we had 4,600 people on this telephonic town hall. That pleases me greatly.

I especially want to thank those of you-all that stayed an extra half an hour. There is several hundred of you still on the phone, and I hope

our efforts to try to get the information out.

So just real briefly, you know, 30 seconds or so, Joe, what do you have to say in closing?

MR. EARLEY: Yeah, thanks, Mikal.

I want everyone to know, Mikal is right. Everyone, of course, has a choice. But there is a reason why you hire representation to represent your interests. You hired your lawyers to help you make the right choices. So with -- that's why we're advising you to make this choice vote yes, because it's all there is. It really is. We've gone into that. We mean it. So I'm advising my client that get the heck out of the street. There is a car coming and there is no angel in sight who's going to magically lift you away. This is it. This is our choice. Get out of the street now, and

Thank you.

we can move forward.

MR. WATTS: Perfect.

Jim Frantz, 30 seconds or so.

MR. FRANTZ: Yes, sir. This is a hell of a great settlement. It's like nothing that none of us have ever seen before. \$13.5 billion from a public utility. I've litigated against these public utilities for 15 years now. I went to trial against one that's not involved here, but a separate entity. They are a

Page 106

you've gotten information. If you haven't -- and before I say if you haven't, I do want to thank the gentlemen that are on this panel with me. I think it's all of our goals to get information out.

If you didn't get a question answered, for some reason, e-mail your questions to your own lawyer. We're going to coordinate answers to that, and we'll do this again. I record answers for my clients, and I put it on firesettlementfacts.com. But we'll also do this again every Saturday between now and the end of the vote. So today's the 18th. We'll have another one on the 25th at 12:00 p.m. Pacific Daylight Time. We'll have another one on the 2nd, one on the 9th. And then the last day of voting is Friday the 15th, and we'll do one at noon on the last day of voting as well.

Our goal is — and that will be ten telephonic town halls that I've done. These gentlemen have been involved in that. I'm certainly going to invite them again. It's all of our goals to get information out to our clients. And what we decided to do was just to unite our efforts. You know, we're all sending out our own private e-mails and disclosures, but I think it's fruitful to have the wisdom of other people other than the same lawyer you've heard from the whole time. So we as a group decided just to kind of merge

Page 108

Page 107

bear to deal with. They're terrible to get money out of, but we got money out of them here, but after five years of litigation.

We're two and a half years out not -right now, and we've got a whole monster deal on the
plate. You got to be -- really -- you got to really be
almost ludicrous not to vote yes on this deal. There is
no other deal. If the deal doesn't go through, the
chances of you getting a small percentage of this is
pretty low, I think. That's my view.

MR. WATTS: Thanks, Jim. Again -- yeah, thanks, Jim.

Again, it's everybody's individual choice. We want you to vote your conscience and do what's in your best interest. We just believe that -- that this deal is it.

Rich, give me your thoughts, in short.

MR. BRIDGFORD: Yeah, thank you, Mikal.

There is only one plan. There is no bondholder plan.

There is no State plan. There is one plan. It's a good plan. There are overwhelming risks in not voting yes and getting this plan approved. PG&E would end up not qualifying for the 1054 money by exiting bankruptcy on June 30th. That could be debilitating to the recovery of the fire victims if they do not receive that money,

27 (Pages 105 to 108)

Page 109 Page 111 1 and they are -- the victims are put in the back seat to 1 said. I don't know what your individual choice is. I 2 2 want it to be your choice, though. Some of my clients future fires. 3 We could lose our funding. We could lose 3 have voted yes. Some of them have voted no. A lot more 4 4 all the deals we've worked so hard to make to FEMA, have voted yes than voted no, and we'll get you that 5 5 subro, and we could be facing years of delay. data next week. 6 6 Contrary, if we vote for this plan, But here's what I want: And that is that 7 7 they're going to issue stock in a new company that isn't I told you when we started this process that this is 8 going to be saddled with the victims' claims, insurance 8 your case. We are the hired help. It's your decision. 9 9 claims, the FEMA or the California claims, and it's If as a collective body two-thirds of you choose not to 10 going to have new money from 1054. It's the only plan, 10 accept this settlement, I think the main consequence is 11 11 it's the best plan, and we've worked very hard to obtain all the risks that you talked about and all the delay. 12 12 this result. So we're going to ask you to vote yes. But nobody on this phone is going to stop working for 13 13 Thank you. you just as hard. We will be here in the fight as long 14 MR. WATTS: Thank you. 14 as it takes. I just fear that it could take several 15 15 Elliot Adler, are you still on? more years if we don't take the -- the settlement MR. ADLER: Yes, I am. Thank you, Mikal. 16 that -- that we've negotiated and we recommend to you at 16 17 17 MR. WATTS: Go ahead, sir. this time. 18 18 MR. ADLER: I want to thank you -- I want So, again, thank you for being on this 19 to thank you and the moderators and all the people that 19 call. Please invite yourself and all your -- your 20 20 put this on. I know this was a tremendous effort to get friends to next week's call. And we invite you to go to 21 21 this going. firesettlementfacts.com and to call your lawyers with 22 22 any questions. We're now in an e-mail group where we're I hope this was informative to everyone. 23 23 This was really designed to be just that, an information sharing questions that we're getting, and we'll try to 24 24 session so you can make the best decision for yourself make next week different than this week so you get new and for your family. If there are any questions that 25 25 information. Page 110 Page 112 1 you did not get answered, please, please do not hesitate 1 So, again, gentlemen, thank you. All your 2 to reach out to your attorney. That's what we're here 2 clients, thank you. And we'll be back again in a week. 3 3 Appreciate it. 4 Thank you. 4 MR. ROECKER: Thank you. 5 MR. WATTS: Thank you, Elliot. 5 6 Jerry, you got a comment? 6 7 MR. SINGLETON: Sure. I think it's --7 8 it's been said before. So I would just say if you have 9 any questions, please follow up with your attorneys. 9 10 And to echo what's been said before, no 10 11 one wants you to rush this. Take your time. Make your 11 12 own decision. Vote your conscience. But just to make 12 13 sure your vote counts, we would encourage you to vote as 13 14 soon as you make that decision. 14 15 MR. WATTS: And, Roy, your thoughts. 15 16 MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mikal. 16 17 Folks, this has been a long road for all 17 18 of us. Understand that your lawyers have fought for you 18 19 every step of the way, and the fight is not over yet. 19 20 We're going to continue to do what it takes to make sure 20 21 that we get as much to you as we can as soon as we can 21 22 and we're here to answer your questions and we encourage 22 23 you to vote. And thank you for your time. 23 24 MR. WATTS: Hey, guys, I'll just end it. 24 25 This is Mikal Watts. I want to reiterate what Jerry 25

28 (Pages 109 to 112)

	Page 113	
1	I, PHYLLIS WALTZ, a Texas Certified Shorthand Reporter,	
2	Texas Certified Realtime Reporter, Louisiana Certified	
3	Court Reporter, Registered Merit Reporter, Certified	
4 5	Realtime Reporter, and Certified Realtime Captioner in and for the State of Texas, certify that the foregoing	
6	is a correct transcription, to the best of my ability	
7	from the audio recording of the proceedings in the	
8	above-entitled matter.	
9		
10 11	I further certify that I am neither counsel for, related to, not employed by any of the parties to the action in	
12	which this deposition was taken, and further that I am	
13	not financially or otherwise interested in the outcome	
14	of the action.	
15	Certified to by me this 19TH day of APRILLE	
16 17	2020.	
18	Pl. (Br. 15 A)	
	PHYLLIS WALTZ, RMR, CRR, CRC	
19	Expiration Date: 12/31/20	
20	TEXAS CSR, TCRR NO. 6813 Expiration Date: 12/31/21	
_∠∪	Expiration Date: 12/31/21 LOUISIANA CCR NO. 2011010	
21	Expiration Date: 12/31/20	
22		
0.0	Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc.	
23	Firm Certification No. 223 3000 Weslayan, Suite 235	
24	Houston, Texas 77027	
	(713) 572-2000	
25		

				Page 114
A	account 85:23	administrative	109:17	announced
$\frac{\mathbf{A}}{\mathbf{AB}}$ 24:20	accountable	55:10	ahold 91:11	39:19 46:13
AB-1054 6:13	15:23	administrativ	albeit 15:25	50:9
15:1 16:11	accurate 12:12	40:19	Alcoa 58:13	answer 6:16
17:2 22:12	accused 72:12	administrator	algorithms	11:11 14:8
24:20 37:2,4,9	act 30:10	28:24 29:8	100:11	15:6 21:6
38:12 50:19	action 51:11	33:9 49:12	alive 24:7	25:14 26:5
51:22 57:19	64:21 113:11	86:24 99:22	Allison 101:10	31:1 33:18
63:21 67:7,12	113:14	104:17	allow 14:24	52:20,22 53:2
67:20	actions 50:17	adopt 25:1	46:19 68:10	53:9,25 54:7
ability 56:13	58:8,18	advantage 63:8	80:6	55:15 59:22
91:8 113:6	activism 82:19	advantages	allowed 37:10	76:9 78:23
able 9:21 14:4,8	actual 6:3 43:7	18:11	38:21 88:20	79:9 82:5 83:1
21:23 25:10	92:23 93:1	advice 63:16	97:16	84:11 89:17
30:16 38:4	add 56:23 70:18	76:25 92:10	allowing 2:17	91:1,10,21
	70:20	advise 6:7 11:5	allows 22:14	93:13 96:7
51:9 66:14	addition 18:9	adviser 58:6	92:23	98:2 99:19
67:21 68:14	26:5 46:20	advisers 10:21	alternative 4:24	101:14 110:22
89:4,13 90:21	66:19 78:4	45:16	6:1 13:19	answered 14:2
98:17	additional 30:6	advising 62:10	21:18 73:20	20:23 26:17
above-entitled	81:21	107:9,12	amended 22:11	59:4 77:13,19
113:8	Additionally	advisory 62:7	47:23	106:5 110:1
aboveboard	53:17	advocate 82:18	Americans	answering 77:15
75:7	address 7:12	affect 33:5	103:6	answers 106:7,8
Abrams 42:9	9:25 10:3	afternoon 2:1	amount 10:23	anticipate 105:7
45:15	31:15 34:5	19:23	13:2 15:5 23:2	antidilution
abreast 45:18,20	71:24 77:11	afterward 92:20	23:5,6 25:15	62:23
absolute 75:15	103:2,7	age 88:24	25:16 26:8,15	Antonio 102:1
79:12	addresses 33:13	ago 32:4 49:13	29:17,18 30:25	anybody 54:20
absolutely 12:12	adequate 15:1	agree 30:8 68:21	64:10 65:9,18	63:18 74:15
23:20 25:7,13	adjusted 29:20	101:5 102:18	65:25 67:19	101:19 105:17
67:9	adjustment	agreed 22:4	79:18 80:14	anytime 62:13
absorbing 63:12	29:20	37:13 40:2	84:24 85:9	anyway 77:14
abundance	Adler 2:9 14:10	44:24 45:2	88:5 96:17	83:4
69:22 70:5	14:12,14,15	49:23 56:14,18	100:23 105:12	apart 68:2
accelerate 57:7	53:9,25 69:8	56:20,22 66:15	amounts 62:22	apart 08.2 apartment 34:8
100:2	69:12 109:15	66:19 67:3	Ana 45:12	34:8
accept 20:19	109:16,18	68:24 78:7	analogy 73:24	Apollo 36:2 39:4
23:3,6 28:19	Adler's 2:14	agreement	analysis 68:16	41:9,23 42:13
29:18 30:3	administer	35:12 47:11	analyst 61:2	44:14 46:3,11
67:3,7 76:5	100:8	62:17,21 78:8	analyzed 12:17	46:23 47:8
82:8 111:10	administered	89:18	angel 107:13	Apollo's 41:11
accepted 67:10	1:5 28:23	agrees 12:18,19	Angeles 7:25	42:5
83:6	administration	104:19	Ann 45:12	apologize 11:24
access 19:7 31:8	88:11	ahead 4:7 12:9	anniversary	73:4
34:17,25 55:8	administrations	14:13 15:14	33:2	appeal 29:21
60:8 67:13,19	88:10	78:24 82:21	announce 45:25	30:3,9,11
	00.10	70.27 02.21	aminumice TJ.23	30.3,7,11

Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc. (800) 745-1101

(800) 745–1101 Case: 19-30088 Doc# 7129-25 Filed: 05/08/20 Entered: 05/08/20 15:06:44 Page 31 of 55

				. Tage 113
appeals 28:22	31:7 39:9	17:11 18:24	90:5 96:14	beginning 59:20
appellate 80:2	article 28:3	23:18 54:17	banking 31:7	85:13
application	32:25	76:9	34:13 62:7	begins 54:18
85:17	articles 101:21	average 103:5	bankrupt 67:23	begun 52:15
applied 29:23	Artinian 15:17	awarded 97:3	bankruptcies	behalf 29:10
apply 29:14	asked 21:3	aware 71:13	37:8	36:17 41:5
95:14 97:14	22:18 31:12,25		bankruptcy 1:1	45:15 62:18,19
appoint 54:11	47:1,7 49:5	B	1:2 3:9,12 9:4	66:22
appointed 28:21	56:5 59:3	back 3:1 10:4	9:23 10:7,14	believe 10:6,12
42:21 58:5	60:12 62:1	11:25 19:19,23	13:6,8,9 14:20	10:17 14:18
appreciate 3:22	84:16	27:21 39:9	14:25 16:12,25	16:8,14 18:3
25:9 47:19	asking 5:9 22:6	40:1 52:9 55:5	17:3 18:2,23	25:15 27:1
81:12 112:3	43:7 44:21	64:5 65:24	19:2 20:2,15	31:1 59:20,20
appreciating	96:3	66:8,10,24	22:18 24:2,22	60:25 78:8
96:22	assembly 52:3	68:25 80:5	26:13,24 28:21	84:19 89:17
appreciation	assert 66:10	84:24 85:1	36:9,9 37:5	94:21 108:15
23:16	assessment	101:12 103:15	38:7 42:1,21	believed 28:11
approach 40:2	68:16	109:1 112:2	46:16,18 47:17	Benavides 58:10
approached	asset 68:6	backdrop 34:14	48:15 50:14	benefit 24:21
5:15,16	assets 67:22	backers 6:3	51:4 52:23	35:25
appropriate	assign 35:14	background	55:8 56:17	best 10:17 11:1
50:23 78:11	assignees 35:22	11:19 31:4,19	60:16 61:7	13:15 19:2
96:17 98:15	35:22 36:1	34:13	83:3,5 108:23	25:16 26:25
approval 16:24	assistance 28:23	backstop 41:20	banks 5:15,16	38:9 55:17
approve 16:23	associate 70:25	43:18 45:18,20	9:21 35:1,2	62:24 108:15
approved 4:6,6	assuming 86:14	47:9,11,15	bar 37:24	109:11,24
9:16 10:10	Atlantic 32:25	48:2,19,21,25	Barbara 89:3,4	113:6
14:24 17:9,19	attachment 80:4	51:9,17 60:19	89:12	bet 100:15
49:11 52:9,13	attended 105:17	68:10,23	bargain 95:10	better 30:23
55:7 60:8	attention 71:17	backstopped	based 6:12 32:9	31:1,17 43:25
66:23 67:10	attention 71.17 attorney 6:5 9:1	18:7 54:16	41:15,19 63:10	52:21 68:1
69:4 75:23	59:14 80:10	Baiera 39:15	68:7,15,17	73:15 79:19
77:23 84:21	91:7 104:17	40:21,25 44:11	84:2,3 97:3	97:21
85:1 87:24	110:2	balance 85:10	basic 92:15	beyond 88:23
108:22	attorneys 7:7,8	bald 34:21	basically 28:24	big 25:4,6,6,6
approving 50:22	9:2 15:22	ball 61:1	29:8 36:15	40:19 48:11
	17:15 71:4	ballot 34:11	41:3 46:25	71:21 72:7
April 1:9 28:3 47:25 49:4,4	91:7 110:9	75:16 103:11	57:9 97:9	88:9
50:3 113:15	audio 113:7	ballots 34:9,11	basis 41:4 83:12	
arbitrated 64:16	August 32:16	72:11 78:2	Bay 8:14 52:5	bigger 24:7,8 25:6,7
area 8:14 10:13	38:13,15,20	103:14	76:22 77:12	bill 51:14,16,20
52:4,5,5	40:1 48:6,11	bank 35:2,3,10	bear 108:1	billings 91:6
	· ·	62:4 96:18	bear 108:1 bearing 73:11	billion 4:13 9:14
arguing 13:23	Authority 57:23 authorizations	103:17	beat 51:3 65:7	9:17 10:25
Arizona 103:9	32:10	banked 35:4		
Arlene 91:15	automobile 81:4	banker 89:24,25	beauty 25:11	13:6,17,18 14:19,21 16:11
	available 10:22	banker 69:24,25 bankers 62:3	becoming 104:4 began 47:22	18:7,24 21:24
arrangements	avaliable 10.22	~3111010 02.0	Degan 47.22	10.7,24 21.24

Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc. (800) 745-1101

(800) 745–1101 Case: 19-30088 Doc# 7129-25 Filed: 05/08/20 Entered: 05/08/20 15:06:44 Page 32 of 55

				Page 110
23:5 26:6,24	48:19,24 49:22	59:25	57:4,8 63:24	18:6,9 39:3,7
27:3,20 36:16	49:23 50:2	bunch 6:16	72:14 78:6	43:4 54:15,16
36:20,21 37:18	52:11 67:1	32:14 44:2	95:7	60:15,15,17
37:18,21 38:14	bondholders'	87:20 88:3	calls 33:19 99:2	61:9,16 62:14
38:16 39:1,3,6	16:15 21:23	95:5 98:11	Camp 6:6 52:4	63:2,25 68:20
39:7,20,21	22:21	100:8,10	76:18,18	87:11 88:6
43:4,16,20	bonds 22:7	burned 19:17	Canada 62:4	89:4,13 90:5
45:19 47:4	42:16 44:22,25	32:4 40:17	96:18	90:15 99:16
51:6,8 52:25	book 33:2	55:21 69:10,17	capital 16:20	cash/half 4:4
52:25 56:24	borrow 37:10	70:11,15	39:4 40:24	cast 82:12
57:14 59:9	bottom 3:19	100:12,12	42:14 51:7	Cathy 28:22
60:17 66:7,9	9:19 38:3,24	business 56:21	67:21	49:12 84:14
66:21 67:4,5	42:24 48:5,16	97:10	capitalistic	87:17
	88:1		17:10	
67:18 68:15 84:19 85:16		busy 94:25	Captioner 113:4	caused 20:7 64:4 causes 93:15
	bought 82:3	buy 8:24	-	
87:12 88:6	box 39:23		car 73:11,20,24	caution 69:22
96:19 100:24	103:12	Cal- 17:16	81:11 107:13	70:5
· ·	boy 25:13 40:7	calculate 79:10	care 88:11 91:5	CCR 113:20
	BP 25:5 26:15	79:20	carefully 7:18	cell 33:13 34:5
57:5	32:5,11	calculated 92:17	Carl 101:10	Centerbridge
billions 68:14	breached 44:20	calculating	Carol 88:12	36:2 39:15
	Bridgford 2:8	92:18	96:25 97:1	40:21 41:1,15
binding 43:2,7	15:9,12,16,17	calendar 103:17	Carolina 39:13	42:6 44:11
bit 19:14 22:7	15:17 28:10	California 1:1	carrier 64:24	cents 10:12
67:14 72:17	33:22 40:16	8:11,12 12:18	cars 65:2	25:22 26:14
87:23	44:2 54:7	17:16 18:21	case 1:2 12:15	61:24 66:17
blame 56:6	59:12 83:21,24	19:6 31:25	15:19 17:16	84:20 85:7,8
Bloomberg 28:3	89:10,15 94:18		20:2,14 26:20	105:2,3,11
blow 48:7	98:8 108:18	43:25 46:15	26:25 27:2,6	CEO 48:8 57:22
•	Bridgford's	51:13 55:6,24	27:10,16,23,25	57:22
board 48:25	2:14	56:9,15 60:7	31:9,23,25	certain 34:13
	brief 14:18	66:20 76:4	32:12 35:24	45:11 84:24
body 111:9	briefly 16:22	80:2 93:4,23	39:13 44:5	certainly 10:13
bondholder	31:15 107:2	95:12 109:9	50:15 64:20	26:11 28:12
3:14 21:14	bring 20:6 27:21	call 15:22 20:3	65:3,10,15,16	44:18 56:2
22:23 41:11	32:22 35:21	20:20 39:14	75:22 76:11	69:3 87:19
42:2 49:21	brings 58:12,15	46:1,10,11,23	97:17 102:20	98:22 101:3
50:4 108:19	brought 57:22	52:18 63:14	102:20 111:8	106:18
	Brown 29:9,14	76:8 82:23	cases 25:4,6	Certification
4:21 16:17	29:21,23	90:9 99:1	27:18 31:4,21	113:23
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	BrownGreer	100:10 101:11	32:2,6 64:16	Certified 113:1
22:18 36:12	30:2 100:4,5	111:19,20,21	64:18 65:8	113:2,2,3,4,15
37:16 38:14	bucks 97:12,12	called 29:7,9	69:20 70:6	certify 113:5,10
39:2,22 43:2	budget 100:10	30:4,12 35:10	101:24	cetera 5:15
	buildings	35:22 36:1	cash 9:14,17	challenge 98:18
44:25 46:21,25	100:12	39:15 40:18	10:21,22,23,24	chance 35:7
15 10 10 0 16		17 14 40 17		1
47:12 48:3,16	built 55:22	47:14 48:17	11:1 13:15	74:2

Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc.

(800) 745-1101 Case: 19-30088 Doc# 7129-25 Filed: 05/08/20 Entered: 05/08/20 15:06:44 Page 33 of 55

				Page II/
chances 16:11	85:2 86:5,6,7	clear 9:5,10,13	combine 22:19	82:19
108:9	86:16 87:25	10:18 20:12	come 9:7,17	community-o
change 3:10	88:21,22,25	47:15 48:18	10:5,25 27:7	3:24 43:11
11:5 103:2,7	90:21,23 91:13	74:15	40:9 43:7 48:3	companies 19:6
changes 56:8	91:25 92:2,2,3	clearly 51:6	64:5 65:23	20:6 36:1,22
Chapter 1:4	92:10 93:7	Clerk 9:9 70:23	75:10,11 86:13	37:7 55:4
27:1 56:20	94:5 104:16,18	98:6,10	104:11,18	57:17 63:23
67:24,25	105:8	client 29:11 32:9	comes 66:10	66:6
charges 32:17	claimant 44:3	65:5 73:10	87:11 97:25	companies'
chat 46:25	52:10	107:12	102:3	41:13
chatter 49:6	claimants 30:15	clients 2:7,13,13	comfort 25:12	company 1:6
75:12	38:21 53:14,15	2:14,14,15	comfortable	18:17,18 24:7
check 85:2	65:12 83:8,9	3:18 6:8,25	75:3,4 98:19	24:14 36:14
104:23 105:9	84:18	11:5 13:12	coming 51:25	37:17 38:7
Chico 3:8	claimed 91:16	15:20 17:5	52:2 74:1	41:18 42:1,8
103:12	claims 18:2,5,20	19:25 20:12,20	107:13	55:2 60:4 61:6
chico@wattsg	18:21,22,23	28:4,9,11,16	comment 110:6	63:10 81:2,18
77:11	22:13 28:23	29:4 31:22,23	comments 26:23	109:7
chief 5:5 58:9	29:4,6,6,10,12	32:7,24 33:23	105:15	company's
chime 89:20	29:15 30:2	62:1 65:6 71:3	commercial	56:15 60:10
choice 20:18	32:11 33:6,7,9	72:1,6,25	81:13	62:19
88:1 107:6,10	33:15 37:23	75:11 76:17	Commission	compare 71:3
107:15 108:13	38:1,22 40:18	77:8,10,17	55:24 56:9	compensate
111:1,2	44:5,6 49:12	86:13 91:3	commitment	14:21 15:4
choices 73:12	53:11,22 54:18	99:11,12	43:8 50:19	24:1,5 25:10
107:9	55:3,4,6,10	102:18,19	commitments	compensated
choose 111:9	59:11 60:5,6,7	105:16 106:8	50:17	17:21 19:9
chooses 89:5	60:16 61:7,8	106:20 111:2	committed	20:13 79:4,13
choosing 92:9	61:20 62:3	112:2	32:19	87:9 88:15
chosen 4:8	63:2,6 65:25	close 15:24	Committee 44:7	compensating
Chris 41:10	66:7,12,16,21	30:20 50:23	62:3	97:17
44:14 46:24	69:9,14,16,18	55:23	committing	compensation
47:8	69:20,23 70:2	closed 38:8	57:12	93:10
chronological	70:5,7,10,10	closer 67:4	common 71:5	compensations
83:18 84:2	70:16,21,22	closes 29:14	78:15 90:8	20:24
circumstances	71:1,18 83:10	closing 101:8	communicate	complete 82:9
25:13 26:2	83:14 84:4,9	107:3	102:18	completely
72:8 87:7 94:6	84:21,25 86:21	coalition 64:15	communicating	89:19 92:14
citizens 86:14	86:23 88:4,9	code 83:3,5	33:14	complex 20:1,14
city 5:14	88:11 91:22	Cohen 62:5,18	communication	20:15 54:1
claim 28:17	93:8 96:9,20	colleagues 82:17	44:17	59:15 75:19
29:25 33:12	96:21 99:22,24	99:12	communicatio	component 86:9
38:5 53:5,13	100:2,4 104:17	collected 33:12	42:25 71:10	86:11
53:15,18,20	109:8,9,9	collective 111:9	communities	composition
64:22,24 66:16	class 64:21 83:6	collectively 7:8	58:2	5:13
70:13 71:4,12	95:19	44:4	community 16:5	computed 59:15
81:1,6,9,23	cleaning 102:5	com- 5:24	16:9 35:3	computerized
		I	I	I

Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc. (800) 745-1101

(800) 745–1101 Case: 19-30088 Doc# 7129-25 Filed: 05/08/20 Entered: 05/08/20 15:06:44 Page 34 of 55

	•	-	ī	
103:20	45:17	COU 5:1,6,14	60:22,24 61:8	113:15
concept 43:22	consumer-ow	8:2,24 9:19	creditors 18:4	Daylight 106:12
concern 48:18	7:17 8:2	counsel 5:15	83:6	days 9:17 19:17
102:2 103:23	contacted 8:5	16:18 113:10	criminals 32:5	46:1,11 49:13
concerned 27:14	content 78:3	counseling 91:5	32:14	62:25 77:14
40:15 72:19	contents 81:18	count 91:23	crosswalk 76:3	99:10 102:1,4
75:8	86:7	102:11	CRR 113:18	dead 51:3
concessions 22:6	contest 40:9	countered 37:17	crystal 9:10,13	deadline 22:12
45:24	contingency	country 31:22	10:18 61:1	37:23,24 38:5
conclude 16:16	68:3	57:24	CSR 113:19	40:13 51:14,22
concluded 45:22	continually	counts 11:10	cure 80:12	67:8 86:21
condition 80:6	98:18	110:13	currently 58:7	103:1 105:15
conditions 94:8	continue 20:20	county 5:15 57:1	customer-own	deal 10:4,6,10
conducted 49:14	47:23 67:17	couple 28:14	3:24 4:22 5:13	10:16 11:1,4
conference 48:9	74:14,19 76:10	38:23 44:10	43:11 51:2,10	13:6,7 22:4
confines 14:20	110:20	49:2,13 96:3	51:17,18,23	28:10 30:18
confirm 33:10	continued 50:12	98:25 101:6	customers 57:7	41:6,14,16,21
confirmation	continuing	course 56:12	58:2 64:1	42:11 43:25
22:11 102:14	65:21	59:12 61:15		44:21 46:12,13
confirmed 25:1	contract 49:23	98:11,20 107:6	D	46:15 47:1,11
28:17 40:10	contractor	court 1:1 3:8 4:7	dad 13:4	48:7,12,20,21
56:19	58:12	5:22 9:4,11	daily 41:3	49:23 57:5,6
confusion 18:12	contracts 32:9	13:6,8,9 21:18	damage 70:14	57:11 59:16
conscience	contractual	22:3 23:25	damaged 79:23	65:24 66:2,14
102:19 108:14	47:10	26:10,24 28:21	damages 67:22	68:9,13,14,17
110:12	contractually	28:22 32:16	79:11 80:3	68:19,24,25
consent 35:13	43:2 49:25	38:16,22 46:18	92:16,18 93:17	69:6 75:7 95:2
consenting 44:3	Contrary 109:6	50:3,15,22,23	93:17,19 94:9	108:1,5,7,8,8
52:10	coordinate	51:4 67:10	94:10	108:16
consequence	106:7	75:23 77:22	Dan 86:20	dealing 3:4
49:16 111:10	copy 34:3	113:3,22	Danko 28:7	deals 17:15,17
consequences	corners 97:10	court-appointed	data 111:5	19:5 66:25
90:11	coronavirus	58:6	date 37:25 38:1	72:5 75:24
consider 43:22	33:24 46:6	courts 27:22	87:12 96:20	109:4
48:2	59:17,19 64:4	80:2,6	113:19,20,21	dear 55:20
considerable	CORPORATI	cover 17:7 37:3	dates 83:19	death 65:11
3:13 13:2	1:3	88:7	daughter 88:13	93:22 94:5
considered	correct 22:23	covered 81:9	88:13,19,22	debilitating
31:11 86:3	89:17 100:23	cow 61:9	David 42:9	108:24
considering	113:6	CPUC 8:8 40:11	45:15	debt 36:13 39:20
51:24	correction 56:12	crazy 12:21	day 5:7 37:14,16 37:22 38:8	56:24
consistently	cost 36:21 37:3	CRC 113:18	39:19 46:10	debtors 1:7
23:12	57:6 63:12	created 13:8	50:4 62:9	22:14 50:17
consortium 5:14	79:22 80:11	34:3 103:20	72:10 74:16	debtors' 22:10
conspiracy	81:7	credit 34:25	79:15,16 92:19	decade 7:20
75:13	costs 88:11	35:9,12,13,15	106:14,15	decades 34:19
constituency	90:22	creditor 18:22	100.14,13	80:2
	-	-	-	

	1			
December 20:11	determines	disagreeing	doing 4:22 11:12	e-mailing 73:3
38:3 43:1 44:1	105:10	27:19	15:7 24:19	78:12,13
52:9 83:14	determining	discharged 61:7	25:20 27:7	e-mails 43:5,6
decide 71:12	79:13	disclose 31:7	33:6,19 73:3	103:19 106:22
102:21,22	devaluation	34:16 75:15	73:22 74:13	eager 14:17
decided 8:16,22	62:23	disclosed 42:16	76:21 77:16	Earley 2:5,20,21
8:23 11:7	develop 29:2	disclosure 59:16	80:11 81:20	23:4,7 70:20
36:13 97:11	developed 4:1	59:22 75:18,22	98:7,9	76:17 80:23
106:20,25	34:13	76:7,11,16	dollar 10:9,12	88:18 107:4
decision 13:13	device 103:17,18	77:22,24 104:1	25:22 26:14	earlier 26:23
13:13 30:7,12	103:19	disclosures	47:5 66:18	54:19 67:2,15
30:12 76:7	dialing 2:2	106:22	69:3 84:21	89:18 100:4
109:24 110:12	Diego 7:21	discount 61:5	85:8,8 105:2	104:20
110:14 111:8	64:13 83:21	discounted	105:11	earliest 83:22
decisions 62:2	difference 63:16	60:14	dollars 44:23	early 36:12 63:1
deems 50:23	79:17 81:5	discounts 18:5	67:4 95:6	69:21 87:20
defended 32:15	86:4,5,15	60:22,23 66:5	Donald 101:21	90:10 96:20
defense 27:5	differences	discretion 35:20	Donato 49:14,19	earnings 63:9,9
delay 17:23 19:9	44:23	discuss 80:10	102:13	63:10
49:7 55:12	different 3:9 7:5	discussion 90:1	double-filed	easy 78:22
109:5 111:11	24:4 45:17	dislocation 34:7	69:19	echo 110:10
delayed 49:5	53:10,10,22	dispute 40:6	downloaded	economic 64:4
deliver 98:9	58:3,3 65:4,25	distress 53:20	71:1	93:17 94:10
delivering 98:5	69:13 71:15	70:13 86:9,11	downside 73:21	economy 24:9
demand 65:5	76:20 79:10	93:20	drawn 24:21	35:6
depending	80:11 82:13	distributed	drew 95:10	edge 87:15
53:23 83:18	84:10,10 87:2	30:19	drive 80:18	educate 11:6
depends 79:9	98:4 105:18	distribution	driving 73:25	educated 100:17
88:18 93:14	111:24	22:13	drum 65:7	effect 36:14 40:8
deposition	difficult 20:1,6	DISTRICT 1:1	dual 40:2,3	40:10 43:19
113:12	72:24	divesting 101:2	due 70:3 94:3	68:3 83:8
depreciated	digital 34:3,10	dividend 56:22	97:1	99:23
80:15	98:10 103:21	94:24	dumped 54:14	effective 87:12
described 30:14	digitally 34:2	dividends 94:15	duplicate 69:24	96:20
designed 8:21	98:7	94:21 95:3,6	71:3	effects 94:3
23:25 24:5,6	diligent 100:20	95:13,18,19,20	duty 72:25	effectuate 72:7
24:12 105:17	diligently 102:6	division 62:4	84:18 99:23	effort 109:20
109:23	diminution	Document 9:3,7		efforts 106:21
desk 102:3,5	79:14 80:13	43:12 50:14	E	107:1
despite 36:11	92:18,24 93:5	51:5	e-mail 20:21	eight 29:2 102:1
destroyed 53:5	DIP 41:25	documentary	33:13 34:3,5	either 10:22
detail 3:18 30:25	direct 76:19	33:3	46:2 75:17	30:3 52:4 68:8
52:20 53:3	direction 3:9	documentation	76:10 77:11	69:6 75:17
determine 61:18	58:23 74:2	96:10	78:1,2,10,13	95:18 104:20
85:4	directly 89:17	documents 5:22	91:17 98:6	elected 24:3
determined	91:9	9:5 35:15 75:9	103:21 106:6	ELECTRIC 1:5
85:10	directors 57:21	76:8 81:17	111:22	eliminate 19:4,5
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc. (800) 745-1101

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 7129-25 Filed: 05/08/20 Entered: 05/08/20 15:06:44 Page 36 of 55

	1	1		
19:7,8	58:14	everybody's	experience	familiarity 70:4
eliminated	equal 86:15	36:7 108:13	28:12 58:13	family 46:5
69:25 70:8	equipment 57:3	everyone's	100:18	69:15 86:10
Elliot 2:8 14:9	57:10	10:17 11:9	expert 58:9	109:25
14:15 15:8	equity 4:3,25	85:11	experts 40:11	far 12:18 53:25
39:4 53:8 54:2	16:6,18 22:19	evidence 38:9	61:17,17,22	75:7 80:7
69:8 70:17	31:12 41:5	50:18 57:1	62:10 91:10	91:18 97:16
74:12 99:7	42:10,12 43:24	exact 94:22	103:4	99:25
109:15 110:5	44:8,20,24	exactly 79:13	Expiration	fast 5:17
Elliot's 98:8	45:2,8,9,16	100:11	113:19,20,21	favor 28:5 50:11
Elliott 42:14	46:12,18 47:3	examined 29:5	expires 58:7	74:22
emerge 22:14	47:4 48:1	example 7:24	explain 2:23	favorable 5:16
46:16	49:22,24 50:3	65:23 66:6	34:17 55:23	fear 69:21
emotional 53:19	50:13 51:1	68:20 69:15	explaining	111:14
70:13 86:8,11	52:7,8 54:25	70:12 84:25	73:22	feasible 15:4
93:20	56:24 68:13	examples 58:17	extended 38:3	February 50:8
employed	Eric 100:8,15,19	exception 92:22	extensively 10:5	federal 32:16,20
113:11	erosion 79:25	93:24	extinguished	36:23 58:7
employee 58:11	escaped 53:18	exchange 22:5	93:22 94:10	feel 77:15
employment	especially 23:13	exchanged 81:2	extra 57:10 82:4	feelings 56:4
97:10,16	105:23	81:17	105:24	fellow 42:17
empty 103:11	essence 8:10	exclusive 36:10	extraordinary	felt 93:20
encourage 11:7	22:16	38:18	30:25 87:6	FEMA 17:16
74:21 87:4	essentially 8:24	exclusivity	Exxon 25:5 26:8	18:21 19:6
110:13,22	22:1,3,19	36:11,12 38:17	eyes 33:17	55:6 60:6
endeavor 78:22	67:23 68:1,12	39:25		66:12,14,18
ended 31:9 36:6	establish 97:9	executive 30:22	F	109:4,9
energy 58:11	established	exercise 74:25	Facebook 5:11	FEMA's 66:22
enforce 56:13	22:12	75:1 98:19	facilitate 40:4	fewer 69:9 70:15
enforcement	estimated 56:23	exists 68:9	facilities 34:25	fiduciary 73:16
56:11	estimation	exit 14:25 16:12	facility 35:9	84:17
English 50:25	102:12	16:25 18:23	facing 109:5	fifth 2:3
Enron 25:5	et 5:15	36:10 37:5	fact 103:16	fight 35:24
26:13 52:24	Eugene 80:18	47:17 56:17,20	facts 36:7	65:21 110:19
90:13	evacuation	95:2	fail 69:22	111:13
ensure 64:2	53:17,19 70:9	exiting 108:23	fails 30:24 31:2	figure 41:12
enter 50:22	evaluate 64:6	exits 55:8	31:18 49:21	104:2
56:16 82:2	65:4	exonerated	52:22,23	file 33:12 91:22
entire 97:19	evenly 105:4	32:16	100:19	96:9,21
entirely 66:15	event 11:9 56:18	expect 29:1,12	fair 14:19 20:12	filed 3:7,7 9:3,11
entities 17:17	eventually 30:18	30:16 65:19	56:7 59:22	21:17 22:2
19:7 66:5,20	everybody 6:17	88:7	79:14 93:5	27:1,11 32:11
66:21	38:4 63:5,13	expectation	fairly 4:10	36:8 43:12
entitled 66:10	76:23 77:23	100:7	fairness 92:15	50:15 51:4,17
entity 24:16	78:4 85:5 90:9	expedited 27:1	fake 32:7	51:20 69:23
107:25	96:4 98:15	expedites 22:12	fall 50:7 92:4	70:2,5,9,22
environmental	101:7 104:19	expenses 87:25	false 48:20	83:10,13 91:22
	l	l	I	I

(800) 745-1101 Case: 19-30088 Doc# 7129-25 Filed: 05/08/20 Entered: 05/08/20 15:06:44 Page 37 of 55

				1490 121
91:23,25	37:12,20 40:14	40:12 104:7	Forrest 82:7,10	111:20
files 29:11 81:20	40:16,17 41:6	108:2	forth 3:25 10:5	front 40:19 49:3
filing 46:17 50:2	44:3,7 52:4,4,5	five-year 69:1	13:4 21:18	49:18 50:1
51:14 69:22	52:10,16 53:19	fixing 79:25	59:16	102:13,14
70:4 103:7	54:5 55:22	flames 80:19	fortunate 24:13	Frost 35:3
filings 69:24	57:8,16 59:3,8	fled 70:12 86:10	25:14	fruitful 106:23
fill 63:5	66:17 67:11,21	flee 90:19	Fortunately	fruition 9:7
final 30:1,9,12	70:12 75:5,8	fleeing 91:3	36:25	fuel 37:10
30:12 72:18	76:18 79:17	flight 18:15	forum 105:18	full 23:15 34:20
87:14,15 97:8	81:11 83:7	54:11	forward 10:11	fully 27:25 87:9
104:19	86:10 88:14	float 43:21	11:12 15:7	fund 4:12 18:13
finalized 86:21	90:5,19 91:3,4	flows 63:25	20:23 25:25	18:14 37:2
89:19 90:3	92:20 93:1,16	fluctuate 4:14	40:4 43:7	47:16 48:22
93:9 104:18	93:21,25 94:8	59:23	60:20 61:1	54:9,24 60:18
105:8	96:5,8 97:1	fluctuation 46:7	71:17 107:16	67:13 89:16
finalizing 100:1	100:14 108:25	fluid 61:21	fought 20:8	funded 16:6
financial 6:3	fires 7:20 8:21	focus 58:2	110:18	48:11 62:15
9:21 10:21	17:3,4,7 18:25	folder 102:4	found 32:13	funding 17:9,10
18:15 31:7	20:7 56:1 60:9	folks 2:1 13:3,23	97:4	19:4 43:17,18
34:13 45:16,18	63:20 69:10	39:10 41:5	four 10:8 31:10	48:6 51:20,21
45:19 54:11	76:22 83:19,22	42:4,14,15	59:2,3,4 69:15	68:12 109:3
55:11 59:13	84:3 95:7,22	45:17 83:10	69:16 97:9	funds 55:9
60:10 61:2,17	109:2	98:18 110:17	99:23 105:13	fungible 80:4
61:22 62:4	firesettlement	follow 7:16	four- 69:1	further 77:9
64:6 65:20,23	77:3,17 106:9	69:11 110:9	fourth 2:3 31:13	113:10,12
financially	111:21	following 18:19	fraction 26:11	future 8:22 9:7
22:15 113:13	firm 29:8 31:20	30:1	Fran's 98:8	12:24 15:2
financials 41:9	34:21,22 35:9	follows 28:25	Francisco 39:17	17:2,4,7 18:25
41:15	52:16 62:7	fools 25:18	39:23 58:10	37:3 49:17
financing 9:15	71:10,18 86:21	forced 55:16	Frank 90:18	57:20 60:9
39:9 41:25	98:7,7,8	forcing 42:23	frankly 27:15	64:3 67:21
47:3,4 50:19	113:23	foregoing 113:5	33:18	83:2 95:7,21
57:7 68:15	firm's 99:4	forestry 100:13	Frantz 2:8 12:3	109:2
find 13:18 51:6	firms 32:2 68:17	forever 24:22	12:5,8,10	
77:5	69:19,23 70:3	38:2 88:2	15:18 26:22	G
fine 2:17 44:18	71:15 98:5	forget 50:8	28:9 33:21	GAS 1:5
104:3,5	first 2:19 3:14	form 63:25	35:16 44:2	Gavin 22:17
finish 20:16	3:14 7:15	formal 5:13	61:12,14 64:12	39:15 44:11
105:15	14:18 15:19	formalizing 5:18	65:22 107:19	gaw 23:10
fire 6:6 7:9	16:3 18:1 21:6	format 29:3	107:20	gears 59:2 78:19
14:15,21,25	21:10,13,13	78:2	Frantz's 2:13	general 3:5 94:9
15:2,4 19:17	29:21 31:3	former 5:5	fraud 32:19	generally 23:23
21:5 22:13	32:22 59:12	28:22 42:21	Friday 45:22	77:20 94:6
23:2,3,6 26:12	69:13 79:1	forms 29:2	46:16 106:14	gentleman 39:15
27:14 29:17	83:22 98:22,25	91:12 97:13	friend 19:16	40:23 41:8
31:25 34:7,8	101:9	formula 59:15	46:2,24	48:13 62:5
36:15,17,18	five 10:9 13:9	97:2,15	friends 74:11	100:7
				<u> </u>

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 7129-25 Filed: 05/08/20 Entered: 05/08/20 15:06:44 Page 38 of 55

				1490 122
gentlemen 106:2	94:10 95:20,21	84:3,20,23,24	44:15 45:13,23	H
106:17 112:1	95:25 98:1,3	85:18 86:3,8	45:23 46:12,15	hair 34:20
getting 7:10	103:10 108:8	86:10 87:3,5,8	46:17 48:4,25	half 4:4,12,12
10:8 19:9	109:17 111:20	88:11 89:15,23	50:10,21 51:1	13:14,14 14:7
20:24 24:25	goal 33:8 87:8	90:2,4 91:24	51:11 52:6	14:19,20 23:5
27:2,13 33:22	87:18,21 89:23	92:1 94:24,24	55:23 95:4,4	26:6 32:12
35:25 71:20	90:9 96:8,11	95:14,17,21	95:10	36:16,20 37:21
75:18 84:4,4	106:16	97:20 98:3,13	Governor's 45:7	38:14 39:3,7,7
90:15 95:8,19	goals 56:16	98:16 99:3,20	45:10,12 46:22	39:7 57:14
96:16,19 98:21	106:4,19	99:25 100:16	50:16 52:1,12	63:3 65:1 82:4
102:25 103:14	goes 10:11 23:24	100:25 101:1,7	95:2	
105:5,5 108:9	27:20 68:25	101:12,20,23	grateful 19:24	83:8 105:24 108:4
108:22 111:23	96:4	102:10,21,22	gravy 60:23	
gift 13:5	going 6:12,22,23	103:22,24	great 8:10 12:25	hall 1:9 2:3,12
give 14:25 30:25	7:14 8:23 9:14	104:15 105:7	13:5 17:14	6:23 33:15,20
31:3,16,19,24	10:3,11,14,18	104:13 103.7	21:1 23:7 24:9	104:5 105:21
36:7 38:9 47:6	11:4,7,18	107:14 109:7,8	26:23 27:15	halls 32:23
52:19 75:20	12:23,23 14:4	109:10,12,21	58:25 61:23	74:11 99:6
76:25 78:21	17:9,12,18	110:20 111:12	64:17,19 65:17	106:17
85:10 96:8	18:16,18 20:14	Goldman 62:19	76:13 79:1	hand 62:14
99:20 100:19	21:3,8 23:10	good 2:1 3:15	105:13 107:21	handed 85:16
108:17	25:10,21,22,23	10:6 14:7	greatly 105:22	handful 7:8
given 45:24 46:6	27:21 28:18	19:22 21:15	Greer 29:9,14	27:18
47:2 63:22	29:11 30:16,17	23:2,5,5 25:15	29:22,23	handle 30:17
giving 63:18	30:22 33:3,6	37:8 41:6	grid 56:25 58:3	97:5
65:14 96:21	36:15 37:18	47:18,20 48:23	95:7,21	handled 84:8
glad 6:15	38:4,7 39:17	49:1 61:14	ground 43:15	handling 7:20
Gleason 15:17	40:3 42:1	64:5 74:1 77:4	group 38:21	64:18
global 40:4	43:23 44:15	77:4,15 84:15	39:4 70:22,22	happen 54:20
go 2:19 4:7,14	49:7,8 52:8,23	89:6 100:13	75:17 106:25	67:6,12 71:6
4:14,15 5:22	54:9,9,11,12	102:23 105:19	111:22	84:23 85:6
9:9 11:23 12:3	54:13,14 57:2	108:20	groups 7:7 18:4	93:16 102:21
12:9 13:20	60:20 61:1,13	gotten 14:6	23:11 60:22,24	104:16
14:13,21 15:14	61:20 62:1,9	37:20 106:1	66:3	happened 3:6
17:12 21:11	62:12,14,24	governance	guarantee 68:21	21:13 22:1
24:3 35:6 44:8	63:3,5,11,17	56:10	84:22	26:25 38:5,19
45:1,19 46:19	64:7,10 65:9	government	guaranteed 5:1	39:1 40:14
47:20 49:1	67:6,8,12,20	36:23	guess 60:1 62:24	41:2 44:10,24
54:9 59:5	68:4,5 69:2,16	governmental	62:24 96:11	45:4 46:16
60:16 63:17	71:6,6,11,11	24:16 66:4	guessing 96:12	88:23 90:13
65:25 66:8,24	71:12,15,16,17	governments	gut 64:3	happening
67:2,3,18 68:5	72:15,16,20	36:23	gut 04.3 guy 41:10 58:9	22:16 56:1
76:16,20 77:8	74:2,17,19	Governor 4:6	59:6 100:10,20	75:21
77:18 78:19,24	75:12 77:25	8:12,16,22	guys 11:23 32:1	happens 68:2,22
80:24 82:2,16	78:1,3,16,19	12:17 16:6	32:6,24 37:23	68:25 73:14
82:21 83:22	80:25 81:20	24:19 37:1,14	99:4 110:24	79:3 93:9 94:4
89:1 92:23	83:12,18 84:2	38:12 43:21)	94:6 104:21,22
07.1 72.23	03.12,10 04.2	JU.12 1 J.21		

(800) 745-1101 Case: 19-30088 Doc# 7129-25 Filed: 05/08/20 Entered: 05/08/20 15:06:44 Page 39 of 55

				Page 123
happiest 66:13	72:17 107:8	honored 15:20	ID 31:24	56:11 58:9
happy 25:24	111:8	hope 19:19 46:4	idea 3:11 7:5 8:8	67:11 76:5
79:8	helped 24:12	77:16 85:6	8:11 9:5,15,19	81:18 90:22
hard 20:5 25:17	74:22	105:25 109:22	10:1 11:15	increase 21:24
25:19 56:4			43:12,13 50:6	increases 57:13
	helpful 7:4	hopeful 27:11	· ·	
74:10 95:4,10	helps 100:8 hesitate 110:1	hopefully 14:6	51:3,18,19	incredible 37:6
109:4,11		56:17 75:2	88:9 94:13	incredibly 11:8
111:13	hey 83:12 87:24	97:20	ideas 9:23 12:2	incumber 43:19
hardening 8:20	98:12 110:24	hoping 46:7	identify 9:21	independent
56:25 95:7,21	hide 32:8	horse 13:5 51:3	IDs 33:9	58:5
harem-scarem	hierarchy 77:21	horses 40:7	immediately	index 63:24
54:13	high 44:21 73:12	hospital 90:20	41:11 60:18	indication 48:6
harmed 73:18	96:15,16	90:25 91:2	100:3	70:23,24
hazard 60:1	higher 18:8 42:6	host 56:14	impaired 18:3	indicted 32:13
he'll 79:4	44:25	Houlihan 62:6	60:16	individual 29:4
head 27:13	hire 63:15 88:3	hour 14:7 21:4	imperfectly	29:17 54:5
34:20	107:7	78:17 82:4	15:25,25	66:3,4,16
headlights 74:1	hired 20:4 33:11	97:12,13	importance	69:14 74:24
health 58:15	55:17 62:2,4,6	105:24	68:11	88:24 95:15
healthcare 91:6	107:8 111:8	hour's 14:5	important 2:23	108:13 111:1
healthy 46:5	hiring 87:21	house 19:18	3:2 6:17,18	individualized
hear 7:1 15:12	historical 63:22	34:7,7 55:21	7:15 11:9	65:8
30:5	history 25:3	64:23 91:24	16:23 18:17	individuals
heard 3:15 7:16	26:7 58:10	household 53:22	24:8,24 25:3	26:16 32:18,19
8:4 12:12 13:7	hold 15:23 36:13	69:15	31:4 34:14	45:14 70:1
16:4 25:4	53:14 84:24	houses 90:7	35:19 41:16	90:1
26:22 27:17	96:18 98:12	91:16,19	54:23 59:10,17	industry 58:11
47:8 62:17	104:7	100:11	61:25 63:13	inform 76:20
70:6 77:24	holder 22:9	Houston 113:24	65:8 66:11	information 7:6
106:24	holders 22:13,19	huge 26:8 66:5	67:15 84:17	7:11 14:1
hearing 4:11	50:13 53:10	72:6	importantly	20:17 29:24
26:19 39:12	holding 96:14	hundred 10:12	14:1 18:23	30:6,11 31:15
49:3,10,14	96:17	10:13,22 12:16	19:8 37:3 45:2	74:9,14,18
50:1 102:12,14	holds 85:1	25:22 34:23	55:7 60:7	75:3,19,21
hearings 49:3,17	home 19:19,23	62:8 65:3	impossible	76:15 77:2,5
heart 55:21	20:21 56:5	92:21 100:23	23:19,20	77:21 78:14
heck 71:25	69:16 79:24	105:2,5,11,25	imposter 34:10	98:18 101:11
107:12		hundred-milli	_	
	81:4,4,7,8,10		improved 8:18	105:19 106:1,4
heirs 94:10	86:17	35:9	improvements	106:20 107:1
held 49:10 50:1	homeowner	hundreds 12:14	8:19 50:19	109:23 111:25
62:25	86:3,6,6,12	23:11 44:23	in-person 33:20	informational
hell 64:17	homeowners	87:21	inadequate	104:5
107:20	85:24	hung 11:24,25	36:24	informative
help 14:22 47:1	homes 14:22	hurry 71:21	inaudible 93:6	109:22
47:7,12,19	24:14 79:4	T T	includes 8:6 9:2	informed 20:18
48:4,4,17	90:16	<u> </u>	57:16	infrastructure
56:24 58:1,21	hometown 6:7	IBEW 45:17	including 35:13	58:1
	·	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

(800) 745–1101 Case: 19-30088 Doc# 7129-25 Filed: 05/08/20 Entered: 05/08/20 15:06:44 Page 40 of 55

	_			1 490 121
inhalation 94:4	40:23 41:9	45:5 52:11	JPMorgan	43:9 59:6
initially 8:8	42:5,9,14	87:13,14 96:23	62:19	61:21 73:6
injured 91:4	introductions	101:2	judge 12:19	83:11 90:14
94:2	36:5	Jay 83:17	22:17,18 28:22	106:25
injuries 24:1,6	introductory	Jerry 2:7,8 6:24	37:22 38:17,20	kinds 33:19
90:21 93:15,25	19:16	7:1 12:10	40:1,2 42:19	53:10 77:6
ins 76:4	invest 56:25	16:10 18:5	42:21,22 46:19	kingdom 27:7
inside 37:19	investigated	21:12 22:25	49:3,6,10,14	knew 32:15 48:4
81:7	51:7	36:25 49:22	49:18,19 50:1	50:13
insight 56:15	investing 54:4	51:5 65:20	52:14 83:11	Knighthead
insisted 10:24	investment 13:3	73:21 74:12	87:24 102:13	40:24 44:13
installments	41:22 42:3,5,6	78:12 79:6	102:14	knocked 15:2
104:11,15	62:2,7 89:24	80:16 84:12	judges 64:15	know 2:22 4:4
instituting 86:24	89:25 90:4	85:14 92:11	July 19:24 38:13	4:12,14,18 5:5
institutions 9:22	96:14	93:11 99:7,20	63:20	5:14 6:6,7 7:13
35:4	investor 48:9	99:20,21	June 14:25	7:19 8:7 9:18
insurance 18:20	investor-owned	100:21 101:5	18:24 22:12	11:20 12:14
19:6 36:22	7:23	104:12 110:6	36:19 37:1,5	13:23 14:10,16
55:4 57:17	invite 106:19	110:25	37:13 38:6,8	19:24 21:18
60:6,13 66:6	111:19,20	Jerry's 98:7	51:22 55:7	23:8,12,23
81:1,2,5,8,18	involved 24:17	Jim 2:8 12:3,4	56:17 67:8,11	24:3 25:20
109:8	24:18 26:20	13:22 15:18	108:24	26:5,19 27:19
insurers 66:4	31:5 64:13	26:17 61:11,23	jury 26:11 32:16	33:22 34:6,11
intact 8:18	67:10 76:2,3	62:12 64:9	39:23	35:5 36:2
intend 80:8	106:18 107:25	65:17 74:11	justice 20:6	38:15 44:1
99:13	involvements	99:7 107:19	32:17 49:11	47:7,23 48:5
intended 45:24	41:13	108:11,12	64:14 65:13	52:3,20 55:20
intense 74:4	involving 31:22	job 58:13 64:17	87:17	55:22 56:3
intent 48:14	Iowa 101:25	64:19 74:8		59:7,17 62:3
79:12 92:23	102:1	97:1,4	K	63:4 65:7,9,18
93:2,3	irreplaceable	jobs 100:19	Karen 82:22,23	69:2 70:24
inter- 13:25	23:17	Joe 2:5,19,19	keep 24:6 44:16	71:9 72:3,4,5
interactive	issue 37:11	7:3,16 12:11	71:13,20 73:2	73:8,12,23
13:25 19:13	75:10 85:2	23:4 26:4	96:15	74:7,21 75:19
interest 10:17	105:12 109:7	69:11 70:18	Kennedy 100:8	75:19 76:17,19
35:5,8,11 88:6	issued 30:2	74:10 76:14	100:15,19	77:2,15,20
88:8,10 108:15	104:23	80:21 88:16	kept 8:18 42:1	78:13 79:2,4
interested 7:19	issues 22:9	104:20 107:3	45:18,20	82:8,14,24
8:1 9:3 113:13	24:16 40:5	John 28:21	Kevin 79:2,2	83:10,17 85:22
interesting 26:5	76:21	64:15 84:13	key 59:24	86:20 87:3,11
interestingly	it'll 23:9 25:12	joint 2:12 6:23	kill 47:11	87:18,23,25
50:10	62:23 88:2	Jointly 1:5	Kincade 40:14	89:4,12 90:10
interests 67:16		joke 34:19	55:22	91:16 93:7
107:8	J	Jones 41:9 44:14	kind 2:12 3:4,5	94:14,21 95:16
interplay 7:22	Jack 49:11	46:2	5:4,5 11:22	96:4,8,10 97:2
introduced	January 22:2	Jose 8:7 51:25	23:24 26:17	97:18,24 98:7
35:23 39:10	36:8 44:19	Jose's 43:13	28:15 29:20	98:14,17,22
		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	, , ,

Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc. (800) 745-1101

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 7129-25 Filed: 05/08/20 Entered: 05/08/20 15:06:44 Page 41 of 55

				Page 125
			1	l
99:1,6,8 100:3	lawsuits 23:23	lenient 87:8	35:16	17:21 20:23
100:15 101:13	23:23 32:1,11	lesson 58:20	listened 74:12	33:17 42:4
101:22,24	lawyer 12:13	let's 4:19 12:3	99:8	47:18 48:10
102:8,8,11	17:3 19:21	71:23,23 78:24	listening 6:15	49:7 52:24
103:16,18,21	21:2 29:22	101:6 104:7	20:3 39:24	63:19 73:9
104:4,10	75:5,8 76:23	letter 8:8 49:8	56:3 65:6	79:15,16,21
106:21 107:2,5	77:1 91:12	78:5	listing 86:8	91:10 99:25
109:20 111:1	106:6,24	letting 2:11	lists 81:18	100:23
known 37:1,24	lawyer's 74:24	level 29:21 30:9	literally 44:22	looked 7:17 8:13
knows 9:18 52:1	lawyer-wise	levels 44:22	litigate 62:13	61:3
100:11	78:5	63:22	litigated 107:23	looking 10:7
	lawyers 2:6,11	lever 43:22	litigating 27:3	17:22 47:16
L	2:17 12:15	leverage 21:23	27:16	48:22 50:6
labor 45:17	20:4,5 26:20	37:6	litigation 23:24	80:14 83:9
lack 68:1 70:3	27:15,18,25	liabilities 18:19	23:24 26:9,15	98:13
lacked 48:19	29:10 34:23	liability 27:4,5,6	32:3 64:13	looks 71:3 83:17
LADWP 7:25	42:17 45:7	Libby 43:14	90:11 100:16	88:12 98:24
Lahoud 41:10	61:25 64:8	Liccardo 8:6	108:3	101:9,12 104:9
44:14 46:24	75:15 76:9,25	43:14	little 22:7 55:13	Los 7:25
47:8	78:10,14	life 3:1 77:7	67:14 72:17	lose 17:9,18 38:1
Lahoud's 48:1	102:17 105:14	lift 107:14	87:23 104:24	60:19 109:3,3
land 80:5,5	105:18 107:8	lifted 38:20	104:25	losing 19:4,5,7
landscaping	110:18 111:21	lifting 39:25	live 17:9	loss 53:6,16
79:25	lead 16:16	likelihood	lived 53:18	64:11 70:11
language 77:23	leaders 39:5	104:15,22	lives 11:9 14:22	79:5,18 92:21
large 2:7 14:15	leadership 17:15	likes 94:13	20:7 26:1	97:10,10
30:15 34:22	leading 42:10	Likewise 53:14	27:21 103:6	losses 10:12 24:1
72:15	learned 41:14	limited 93:5	loan 35:21	24:6 25:11
larger 10:23	43:15,17 51:8	limits 62:21	loans 41:25	52:25 57:20
largest 7:7 25:2	58:19	Linda 92:6	85:15	lost 2:25 6:9
25:2 26:7	leaves 51:2	line 3:19 9:19	local 35:2 36:23	23:13 27:21
41:17 42:2,16	led 36:5 69:24	15:21 20:16	58:2 66:20,21	53:12,13,21
57:23	90:20	38:3,24 42:24	logistics 29:8	69:15 79:3
lark 51:24	left 74:25 82:1	48:5,16 78:5	30:15	80:20 81:6
lasted 26:9,13	95:23 101:1	82:4 88:1	Lokey 62:6	88:13,23 96:11
lastly 19:11	104:6 105:14	82:4 88:1 lines 44:17	•	97:1,16 102:4
78:10			long 7:14,19	,
late 46:16 48:17	legal 12:16	lingering 94:3	14:21 24:22	102:25 103:9
103:24	92:17	lion's 105:9	27:20 52:20	103:22
law 32:2 34:19	legislation 37:9	liquidate 63:7	53:2 68:2 72:4	lot 3:6 10:19
34:21,22 35:9	43:19 50:9	liquidated 61:13	75:2 100:24	13:17 15:24
38:12 69:19,23	legislative 51:12	63:1 87:20	102:8,11	17:12 19:25
70:2 71:10,18	51:13,15	89:24 90:4	110:17 111:13	21:16 31:21,25
80:1 92:22	legislature 8:15	liquidating	longer 6:9	32:1 45:13
	8:23 16:8	96:19,24	longest 72:18	52:20,24 54:4
93:4,23 98:5	legitimate 33:7	liquidity 47:10	look 5:1,23 8:11	56:3 58:15
100:13	40:5	48:20	8:12 9:9 11:12	59:7 60:11
lawsuit 3:7	lender 35:12	listen 13:12	13:5 15:7	61:2,3 63:21
	1		•	1

Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc. (800) 745-1101

(800) 745-1101 Case: 19-30088 Doc# 7129-25 Filed: 05/08/20 Entered: 05/08/20 15:06:44 Page 42 of 55

				Page 126
]			
68:11,13 71:22	manner 56:20	mediation 42:20	19:22 28:16,20	61:10 63:11
75:12,14 77:2	March 45:5,21	mediations	56:2 75:4,10	64:10 65:10,18
78:18 82:13	46:14,23 47:22	45:14	86:2 91:1,20	65:21 67:20
83:10 84:12,16	48:17 50:14,16	mediator 22:17	97:7 110:16	68:13 81:5
86:12 88:1	52:13,14	medical 91:5,9	million 32:7	85:5 87:19
90:11 103:2,5	margin 59:24	meet 39:16,18	41:19,21,22,24	88:6 90:7,10
103:16,17,18	Mark 62:5	81:22	41:24 42:3	92:8 95:20
111:3	104:10,10	meetings 33:16	60:3,14 62:8	96:6 97:2
lots 90:6	market 37:13	33:20 62:20	64:1 65:1	100:24 105:11
louder 58:19	38:6 54:4,14	65:7 74:19	87:13,14,25	108:1,2,23,25
Louisiana 113:2	55:1 59:7	75:2 84:13	88:5	109:10
113:20	79:14 93:5	members 44:6	millions 44:23	moneys 43:20
low 108:10	market's 46:7	45:10	mind 37:18 46:5	Monica 97:23
lower 35:7,11	mass 31:21 76:3	mental 91:6	65:23 82:16	97:24
lowered 35:7	88:9 100:9	mention 9:4	99:4	monitor 58:7
lucky 27:10	master 84:14	mentioned 4:23	minds 12:16	monopoly 61:9
ludicrous 27:20	Masters 103:4	8:5 9:2 36:25	mine 28:13	monster 108:5
108:7	match 36:20	42:20 46:25	73:10 81:16	Montali 12:19
lump 104:11	92:2	48:8 49:22	minimize 72:24	37:22 38:20
	matching 55:9	54:10,15 89:18	minor 88:19	40:2 42:19
M	materials 78:6	merge 106:25	minors 88:19	49:4,10,18
machine 61:9	math 88:9	Merit 113:3	minutes 78:17	50:1 52:14
magazine 33:1	Matosantos	merits 65:10	78:18 82:1	102:15
magic 82:24	45:12	met 19:17 40:25	95:23 104:6,8	month 38:19
magically	matter 44:12,13	44:11,12,13	105:14	44:19 61:10,10
107:14	72:20 95:18	45:13 67:8	misinformed	monthly 64:1
mail 101:25	103:13 113:8	methods 98:5	48:14	months 40:12
102:2,7,25	mayor 8:6,7	midst 64:4	missed 29:24	63:4,4 96:13
103:9,22,25,25	43:14,14 51:25	Mikal 2:2,21	103:1	96:15 99:23
main 68:13	52:2	3:21 6:20 7:2,3	Mississippi 32:5	monumental
111:10	mayors 5:14	11:25 13:2	mistake 29:23	20:8
maintained	McNicholas	14:14 15:13,16	mistaken 83:4	morning 43:5
38:18	15:18	15:22 19:22	modeled 100:14	44:13
major 55:13	mean 4:24 23:7	21:19 54:8	moderator	mortgage 57:9
66:12	23:9 25:6 27:4	58:24 61:15	78:21	motion 9:12
majority 26:19	64:19 85:15	68:10 70:21	moderators	21:17 39:25
88:24 90:3	86:23 98:15	72:5,13 77:4	109:19	50:22
making 15:25	103:3 107:11	86:18 87:1	money 9:20,22	mouth 13:5
29:10 97:12	meaning 104:18	89:18,20 91:14	9:23 10:20	move 11:24
man 13:4	means 18:2 22:3	91:20 94:21	12:12,24 13:16	25:25 27:12
manage 54:12	57:9 66:17	107:4,5 108:18	17:2,6 19:8	103:5 107:16
managed 18:15	90:11	109:16 110:16	23:18 27:23	moved 103:9
54:10 55:16	mechanics 28:17	110:25	30:18 36:19	moving 5:17
89:24	28:24	Mikal's 9:8	37:10,19 39:6	58:22
Management	media 31:14	Mike 28:7	40:9 43:8	multiple 53:11
39:4,4 42:15	49:6 75:12	milking 27:6	54:17 55:5	53:14 63:9
manager 59:13	mediating 64:16	Miller 2:5 19:16	57:10 60:9,19	69:14 70:2
L'	<u> </u>		l	<u> </u>

				Page 127
71.4	71.16 111.16	ning voon 00.12	0.15 62.0	ones 8:7 24:12
71:4	71:16 111:16	nine-year 90:12	9:15 62:8	
multiply 71:8	negotiating 21:21 25:18	non-entity 8:25	74:21 78:15	68:12 70:7
municipal 7:24		noneconomic	80:9 86:25	open 2:15 29:13
music 11:13,18	31:9 36:6	93:19 94:9	101:15	44:17 50:3
11:18,21 12:1	62:16,18	noon 106:15	occasions 46:3	105:14,18
12:7	negotiation	normal 24:22	occupants 53:7	opening 26:18
mute 83:24 89:9	50:12	72:8 88:22	53:11,12,21	operate 34:22
91:20 94:19	negotiations	normally 36:9	occurrence 84:3	operation 30:16
muted 53:24	25:19 35:25	North 52:5	October 37:24	operations
N	40:4 41:1 45:8	76:22,22 77:11	39:12 40:1,15	56:10 57:25
	45:9,13,23	NORTHERN	97:20	opining 61:4
name 14:14	neighbors 82:12	1:1	offer 21:23	opinion 12:20
15:17 34:10	82:15,17	note 5:11 22:9	38:16 39:1	16:5 31:17
40:24 41:9	neither 113:10	notes 41:24	47:19	60:13,24
42:21 62:5	neutral 30:4	notice 35:20	offered 35:10	opioids 46:4
100:8	57:5 77:23	notices 83:13	48:17	opportune 61:19
named 41:10	95:11	notifications	offering 47:2	opportunity
58:9	neutrals 30:10	103:7	office 45:10,12	2:17 6:16
narrow 40:5	never 3:25 9:12	notify 103:10	46:22 50:16	70:21 72:10,12
nation 24:10	23:9,9,14,17	November 8:9	52:12 70:25,25	72:22 73:1
national 35:4	25:12 27:21	41:8 43:1,12	103:8,12	opposed 11:4
natural 93:15	40:25 43:9	51:5	officer 68:5	63:11 85:12
94:8	50:10 51:8,10	nudging 72:17	oftentimes 77:14	105:4
near 12:24	51:11	number 8:9	oil 25:5 26:15	optimize 41:5
36:19 55:20	new 18:17,18	14:15,19 17:11	32:6 33:2	option 15:4
nearly 28:5	33:25 35:5	17:14,15 29:19	okay 11:23 12:6	30:24 31:2,18
necessary 6:9	39:6 40:18	30:7,8 34:5	15:12 19:11	52:21 89:6
50:20	44:10 55:2,2	46:3 53:7	28:20 30:21	90:1 99:17
need 2:24 6:8,8	55:22 57:22	82:25 91:3	37:22 47:21	options 31:10,13
11:1 20:3,17	60:4 94:14	92:2 104:19	61:14 65:17	ordeals 90:12
25:9,24,25	109:7,10	numbers 2:7	69:8 70:17	order 17:6 33:10
47:19 58:3	111:24	32:8 33:13	83:16 84:6	33:24 37:11
63:7 67:21	NewCo 54:25	52:18	94:12 101:6,18	50:22 57:10
72:17 74:18	55:8	nursing 24:14	ol' 24:14	62:22 72:6
76:6 81:19,21	news 48:23		old 82:12,17	83:5,18,19
83:13,15 90:6	Newsom 8:13	0	older 38:21	95:6 96:10
91:11,22 96:10	22:17 37:14	Oakland 52:2	on-line 68:22	ordered 42:20
104:2	38:12 46:17	Oakland's 43:14	69:21 70:4	orderly 56:21
needed 5:17	50:10 51:11	objection 30:5	98:25 99:16	original 41:25
37:11 63:1	Newsome 22:17	obligation 75:15	once 8:22,23	originally 3:7,7
64:25 82:25	42:22,22	obligations	11:6 29:14	36:3 38:17
95:6	nice 9:19 11:22	47:10	30:12 31:23	ought 38:10
needs 73:1 82:9	46:24	observer 56:14	38:6 54:23	98:17 101:22
negotiate 42:7	night 5:8 73:25	obtain 109:11	61:6 85:9,9	outbuildings
43:23 74:22	nil 16:12	obtaining 16:24	89:13 101:1	79:24
negotiated 34:1	nine 26:13 52:24	34:2	104:16,22	outcome 73:15
34:15 39:11	53:1	obviously 3:8	104.10,22	101:4 113:13
	JJ.1		103.0,10	101.4 113.13

				Page 120
outer 87:15	63:23 75:16	pay-outs 83:17	53:1 54:25	45:8 46:8,15
outlined 54:18	78:7 81:9	84:8	66:8 85:1,4,12	48:8 50:10,20
outs 76:4	88:21,21 90:22	paycheck 97:11	88:8 100:23	54:25 55:8,11
		1 0		
outvoted 82:15	91:13 95:1	payer 95:9,12	104:24 105:4,9	55:25,25 56:4
overall 21:24	99:16	paying 35:11	percentage 18:8	56:8,14,19
66:14 89:6	participants	38:13 59:11	44:25 52:15	58:18 61:6,8
overhaul 56:9	35:21 42:16	60:17 64:1	69:3 108:9	63:25 67:7,13
overseeing	participate 37:4	payment 10:23	perfect 13:14	67:17,19 68:4
58:11	37:25 47:6	10:23 30:13	15:3 19:2	68:6,20 97:17
oversight 56:11	48:24	payments 28:18	20:11 107:18	108:22
58:8,22	participated	57:7 87:16	performance	PG&E's 56:10
overstate 102:16	47:2	104:11	64:3	67:22
overwhelming	participatory	payout 30:2	period 12:24	phone 7:9 11:16
28:7 52:15	47:3	pennies 10:9	29:3,6,12,16	11:24 14:10,11
74:4 75:20	particularly	69:3	72:3 94:20,22	34:5 46:1 76:9
108:21	57:1	penny 66:18	96:13,21 97:19	82:4 105:25
overwhelmingly	parties 37:10	people 2:22,24	97:20 100:2	111:12
28:11 73:23	42:23 45:18,20	4:11 5:9 8:10	105:20	photo 33:9
owned 34:21	47:9 48:2	10:11 15:10	permission	photography
owner 69:18	113:11	17:4,11,14	21:17	81:14
	partners 47:15	18:8 20:2	person 30:4,5,7	photos 81:15,17
P	48:19,21,25	21:16,19 22:22	33:16 35:22	phrase 23:3
p.m 106:12	68:10,23	23:11,12 25:17	68:5 93:14,23	PHYLLIS 113:1
Pacific 1:5	parts 58:3	26:14 28:8	personal 53:6,12	113:18
106:12	party 35:13	34:18,23 35:21	53:13 65:1	physical 34:6
packages 65:5	56:22	36:6,13 44:3	93:18	picked 34:9
packet 75:17	pass 47:12 83:2	53:10 56:3,25	personally 2:24	picture 24:8
Page 22:8	83:15 94:7	60:11 61:3,3	33:17	31:24
paid 10:8 26:11	passed 47:25	65:19 68:13	persons 45:11	pictures 81:10
26:12,14 30:8	48:9 51:15	69:1 70:9,11	52:4	81:14,15
33:8 52:25	94:2 95:8	70:16 71:7,22	perspective 3:5	pie 42:10
57:14 60:21	passes 93:14	72:11,13,15,21	23:19,22 25:15	piece 37:8 84:9
64:24 66:17	Pat 15:18	72:23 73:3	31:11 79:20,21	101:25 102:2
67:22 69:1	path 22:10	76:20,24 80:24	92:17	pieces 42:10
82:11 85:9	Patterson 45:12	82:18,23 83:13	Peter 85:22,22	pile 99:20
88:4 102:22	pay 10:11,14	83:15 84:16	petition 55:10	PIMCO 42:15
pain 90:22,25	36:15,21 37:11	87:2,4,21 88:3	PG&E 1:3 7:23	pissed 56:6
93:19	37:18,18 39:6	92:23 94:1,7	8:18,20 10:17	place 33:24
panel 30:10,13	44:24 54:17	96:21 97:3	10:25 14:24	56:14 62:21
106:3	56:24 61:16,20	98:12 99:2	15:23 16:6,12	72:23 77:18
paper 34:9 78:2	63:1 71:17	100:3,13 105:5	16:25 17:5	90:2
78:3 98:6	84:20,25 85:5	105:5,21	19:7 21:23	plan 2:18 3:14
103:13				_
papers 103:1	85:7,9 90:5	106:23 109:19	22:4,5,5,20	3:15,20 4:3,9
Paradise 103:12	94:24 95:3,5	per-head 83:12	24:3,13 36:8,9	4:17,19,20,22
part 13:24 27:25	96:20 97:13	percent 10:23	36:13,19 37:4	4:25 5:6,11,12
32:3 40:3	100:25 105:1,3	37:15 41:17	37:6,15 38:13	5:13,19,23 6:1
34.3 70.3	105:11	42:6,8 44:5	38:18,25 39:19	6:11,11 8:3,17
	•	•	•	•

(800) 745–1101 Case: 19-30088 Doc# 7129-25 Filed: 05/08/20 Entered: 05/08/20 15:06:44 Page 45 of 55

				1490 127
8:17,23,24 9:6	110:1,1,9	predictable	problem 4:19	79:3,5,11,15
9:10,16 10:2,3	111:19	63:25	8:1 40:20	79:15,16,22
12:14,16,20,22	pleased 45:23	preface 101:15	48:11 92:13,16	80:3,4,8,13,15
12:22,23,25	pleases 105:22	prefer 23:3	93:2	81:11,16 92:7
13:14,15,24	plus 30:15	prefire 80:7,12	problems 38:10	92:8,19,25
14:18,23 15:3	point 22:23 26:7	prepare 65:5	48:3 80:1	93:3,18,18
16:3,4,6,6,9,14	27:9 50:12	prepare 03.3 preparing 45:6	procedure 88:22	proposal 3:23
16:15,15,18,18	59:24 64:14	prerogative	proceedings	3:25 5:2 7:17
16:23,24 17:1	71:9 94:23	98:23	113:7	8:2 9:6 102:23
17:1,8,18,25	97:12	press 14:3	process 2:23	102:23
18:11 19:2,3,3	points 7:15	pressure 38:24	13:25 20:1	propose 36:10
21:14,18,20	police 5:5	50:12	24:22 28:17,25	proposed 8:8
, ,	_		30:14 33:6	36:20 37:1,14
22:5,11,21,23	political 82:14	pressuring 73:2		· ·
26:21 28:5,8	politics 24:17	pretty 3:15 98:3	45:6 46:8	38:13 43:13
28:16,19 30:24	pollution 39:13	100:12,14	54:18 56:21	prosecute 71:12
31:2,12,18	population	108:10	61:16,21 62:16	protect 57:20
36:10,14,20	103:6	prevent 8:21	69:1 71:13	protection 15:1
37:1,14,20	portion 4:13	55:9,25 62:22	72:7 86:13	proud 64:17
38:18 39:2,5	35:14 54:15,16	95:7	88:3 93:9	prove 80:20
39:21 40:2,3	57:13 81:6	preventing	100:2 104:21	proved 32:18
40:10 44:8,16	86:6,16	95:21	111:7	provide 51:17
45:2 46:18,21	positions 90:8	previous 31:4	processes 38:2	56:14 57:10
47:23 48:5,12	positive 58:18	32:23 100:16	processing	75:23
49:20,21,24,24	58:20	previously 57:18	38:11	provider 91:9
50:3,5,7,13	possessions	99:2	procured 78:17	providing 97:15
51:1,2,10,19	88:14	price 13:19	produced 33:4	99:8
51:24 52:7,8	possibility 4:23	27:22 41:20	produces 61:10	provisions 62:23
52:17,22,23	possible 20:24	59:22,25 60:20	professional	75:6,25
55:7,14 56:19	47:17 48:22	96:15,16	63:15	public 2:16 9:4
57:24 60:8	73:13 87:1,4	priced 63:9	professionals	24:16 55:24
66:22 67:7,9	95:11 99:16	priceless 23:17	18:15 44:4	56:9 57:24
68:3 69:4 74:5	possibly 6:7	Prime 9:9 70:22	52:10 54:12	58:12 77:3
82:16 83:5,15	27:8	98:6,10	55:17 64:6,8	107:22,23
99:3,3 108:19	post 55:10 99:5	principals 31:8	program 28:23	published 33:1
108:19,20,20	103:4,8,11	35:23 39:11	progress 56:16	PUC 56:12
108:21,22	Postal 101:21	prior 35:13 93:1	prominent 62:6	pull 68:23 82:17
109:6,10,11	102:7	97:25	promise 21:6	purpose 104:25
planned 33:19	posting 5:10	priority 17:5	promised 43:4	pursue 38:22
plans 3:13 9:23	postmarked	prison 32:20	promoting 5:6	94:11
9:24 60:13	102:9	private 106:22	pronounce 50:9	pursuing 57:4
plate 108:6	potential 17:7	privilege 30:22	proof 91:11	57:24
play 66:10	potentially 4:21	privileged 15:20	proofs 91:22	push 78:20
player 41:16	poured 36:18	pro 85:19	92:2,3	87:18
playing 11:13,18	power 27:14	probably 55:13	property 53:6	pushing 72:12
11:21	practically 3:13	67:4 70:3 71:8	53:12,13,15,16	put 3:5,25 9:22
please 71:13,16	practicing 34:18	77:8 92:1	53:18,21 65:2	12:25 13:10
87:2 95:24	pre-do 99:23	105:9	69:17 70:11,14	21:18 27:22
	<u> </u>		l	l

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 7129-25 Filed: 05/08/20 Entered: 05/08/20 15:06:44 Page 46 of 55

				Page 130
29:4 30:19	95:24 96:3	107:2	29:19 54:24	18:11
36:14 39:5	98:25 101:7,12	realistic 16:5	60:4 108:25	regionalize
43:4,8 46:17	106:6 109:25	reality 4:24	received 21:17	57:25
50:2,25 59:8	110:9,22	24:11 73:5	39:14 46:1	Registered
68:3,4,14 77:2	111:22,23	94:22	60:14,17 71:9	113:3
80:5 92:1,3	queue 21:7	really 3:16,20,25	91:5,5	regular 24:14
99:13 106:8	quick 5:11	4:20 5:2,9 15:7	receives 89:5,14	regulated 17:10
109:1,20	quicker 27:12	16:15 23:15	receiving 18:5	reinstate 56:22
puts 102:3	88:4	24:20 27:22	89:16 96:5	reiterate 110:25
putting 7:4 13:3	quickly 7:13	31:16 34:17	recession 64:4	reject 65:24 69:6
42:11 51:18	29:19 86:25	42:7 45:6	recognizes 80:3	related 91:2
102:25	87:4 88:4	49:16 64:17,17	recommend	113:10
	90:15	70:23 71:24	29:16 74:23	relation 22:17
Q	quote 50:16,24	72:19,21 73:7	77:8 111:16	relationship
qualify 17:2	quoted 28:3,6	73:7,9 74:10	recommendati	83:22
qualifying		77:4,17 88:18	13:11	relationships
108:23	R	95:10 99:25	recommending	34:14,16 36:5
quantities 72:6	race 40:8	107:11 108:6,6	16:7 20:18	relative 18:3
quantity 72:15	radically 3:10	109:23	31:11	60:23
quasi 24:15	raise 16:11 51:9	Realtime 113:2	record 17:22	release 66:19
question 5:12	67:21	113:4,4	34:4 103:20,22	reliable 50:20
21:16 23:1,8	raised 38:25	reason 5:18 10:2	106:8	relief 50:23
26:3,18 30:23	ran 43:15	20:4 33:12,15	recording 99:1	rely 6:4 78:15
52:21 53:2,4	Randall 42:22	33:19 34:1,12	113:7	remaining 85:3
54:1,8 55:20	rare 65:2 94:6	47:6 55:13	records 91:9,13	99:18 105:12
61:15 73:7,9	rata 85:19	60:3,12 69:20	recover 6:8,8	remediate 17:6
79:2 80:17	rate 57:5,13	73:17 74:4	38:4 66:18,22	60:9
82:2,23 84:6	73:12 95:9,11	75:14 93:7	80:7,12	remediation
84:11,16 88:13	95:12	98:4 106:6	recovery 54:5	18:25
93:6 101:17	rates 35:5,7,8,11	107:7	57:13 108:24	remember 21:16
104:7,10 106:5	RBC 62:18	reasonable 15:5	reduce 57:6	23:22 37:24
questioning	reach 81:21 82:3	reasonably	reduced 85:11	63:3 67:15
87:24	110:2	27:24	85:12	72:5 78:20
questionnaires	reached 9:1	reasons 10:19	reductions	84:17
32:10	20:10 46:15	16:3 69:5,13	85:19	render 30:11
questions 6:16	49:22	73:17	reference 51:4	renegotiate
7:14 11:12	read 22:7 71:2	reassuring 64:2	referred 32:2	10:18 68:9
14:2,4,5,7,17	75:9 77:6,24	rebuild 2:25,25	refinance 35:7	69:7
15:6 19:12,13	101:21 104:1	14:22 19:25	refinancing	renegotiated
20:21,23 21:3	ready 12:5	64:25 79:12	39:20	10:2,4
21:5,8,11	74:16 75:2	90:7,16 92:9	regarding 22:6	rental 69:17
28:15 33:18	82:23 84:4	92:23 93:2,4	75:21,25 76:7	renter 69:18
59:3,4 71:20	101:19	rebuilding	76:11	85:22 86:2,5,7
75:11 76:9,23	real 23:21 25:17	79:23,24	regardless 16:17	86:12
77:9,13,16,18	33:14,15 53:14	recall 36:8 39:25	21:22 53:6	renters 85:23
78:18,19,22,25	53:16 70:14	receive 17:6	64:10 86:11	86:13
82:5 83:2	93:17 96:15	18:6,7,13,14	regards 16:13	reorganization
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

				Page 131
39:21 67:25	resolution 27:12	67:16 68:23	28:15 55:19	39:17,23 43:13
repair 79:22	40:5	70:23 72:16	74:10 75:4	51:25 64:13
80:5	resolved 27:2	73:19 77:14,23	76:21 78:13	83:21 102:1
repairing 81:3	71:11	78:16,20 81:25	85:25 90:24	Santa 40:17
repairs 80:8	resolving 22:9	85:15 86:19	97:5 104:20	103:12
repairs 80.8	resources 22:20	89:22 91:1	110:15	santarosa@w
44:22	respect 16:4	94:17 97:22	Royal 62:4	77:12
· ·	46:4 49:19	98:23 102:24	96:18	satellite 81:13
repeat 32:24 repeated 89:10	57:15		RSA 22:2,9	Saturday 106:10
-		107:5,9 108:5	KSA 22:2,9 54:17 67:2	saved 101:22
repetitive 14:16	respectfully 50:21 52:22	rights 62:17		
45:9		ripped 32:18	rule 72:14 94:9	saving 26:8
replace 23:18	respective 41:13	risk 16:24 17:7	rules 29:15,24	saw 16:16
81:8	response 28:6	17:13,25 19:4	36:9 56:13	saying 49:1
replaced 23:15	responses	19:5,7 60:20	97:8 99:24	83:11 92:14
replacing 79:24	103:15	68:16 100:17	102:9	98:12
79:25 81:4	responsive 58:1	100:18 101:3	rules-making	says 22:8 23:1
Reporter 113:1	responsiveness	101:13	28:25	49:8 51:5,6
113:2,3,3,4	50:18	risks 16:22	run 16:2 76:2	54:20 64:3
Reporters	rest 77:6	65:21,23 76:5	85:18 99:17	92:7
113:22	Restructure	108:21 111:11	running 40:8	SBA 85:15
represent 7:7,9	78:8	risky 4:11,15,17	91:4 93:20	scale 24:7 41:12
14:15 15:9	result 22:21	4:25 5:2,21,21	100:5	scattered 72:23
44:5 72:25	109:12	RMR 113:18	rural 102:1	scenario 105:1
107:7	retired 22:18	road 73:10,16	rush 110:11	Schaaf 43:14
representation	review 30:1,10	73:25 110:17		schedule 102:15
63:18 107:7	99:2	rocket 37:9	S	scheduled 49:18
represented	reviewed 43:5	ROECKER	Sachs 62:19	102:12
29:9 38:23	Rich 2:8 15:9,17	79:1 80:18	Sacramento	Scott 8:13
71:4,8 78:11	21:19 54:3	82:7,22 83:16	7:25 45:7	scrambling
representing 2:6	55:18 59:6	84:7 85:21	saddled 18:18	10:25
6:5 76:24,24	74:12 78:12	86:20 88:12	18:19,20,21,22	screaming 4:11
represents 28:7	83:20 89:7,9	89:3,12 90:18	55:3,4,5 60:5,5	screen 2:4
request 29:20	94:16 99:7	91:15 92:6	60:6 109:8	seat 109:1
requesting	108:17	93:6 94:13	safe 50:20 98:20	second 9:25
46:19	Rick 94:13	96:2,25 97:23	safety 56:16	14:23 16:7,13
requests 50:21	rid 38:16 61:6,7	98:24 99:15	58:5,9,12,15	16:21 17:8
require 9:14	right 6:21 11:8	101:9 104:9	59:25	31:6 33:5 50:6
10:22 43:16,19	11:19 21:1	112:4	salary 97:3	63:3 66:11
required 16:12	24:2,8,23 27:8	Roeker 78:21	sale 68:4	second-class
33:9 37:4	28:20 29:1	Rolodex 82:17	Sam 43:14 78:21	86:14
45:19 55:24	30:7 32:25	rooms 99:21	78:24 80:17	Secondly 69:19
75:20	34:1 35:12,19	Rosa 40:17	81:25 82:6	seconds 107:2
	36:10 38:18	103:12	84:6 85:20	107:19
requirements 6:13 50:18			86:19 89:2,11	
	39:24 40:7	roughly 29:1	90:17 92:5	secret 75:6
requires 68:14	43:10 47:3	84:18 Pow 2:5 7:2	96:1 101:6	secured 35:8
83:5	55:18 57:2	Roy 2:5 7:3	San 7:21 8:7	39:20
research 41:12	58:22 61:4	19:16,16,19	San 7.21 0.7	securitization
L	•	•	•	•

				1490 152
Security 32:8	Service 101:21	shortly 45:25	sits 102:3	73:13 110:14
see 9:7 12:3	102:7	98:14	sitting 27:2	110:21
14:10 16:24	serving 32:20	show 5:4 29:22	103:11	sophisticated
40:9 51:25	session 21:4	32:17	situation 53:23	62:2 100:9
52:2,3 57:1	51:13,16	sick 90:20	73:6 82:14,18	Sorry 83:24
73:14,19,25	109:24	side 41:11,23	90:13	sort 3:5 57:19
82:16	sessions 51:12	75:24	situations 103:3	sorted 71:7
seek 29:19 57:12	set 3:10 29:3	sides 35:23	six 40:12 63:4,4	sorts 81:19
seeking 55:5	37:2 38:18	41:13	65:23 70:6	sound 22:15
seen 16:10 83:23	39:16 59:15	sight 20:16	72:3,4 96:13	sounded 3:15
84:1 107:22	64:15	107:14	96:15 104:6	source 77:4
selected 30:4	settled 66:7	sign 33:10 91:8	slam 101:20	sources 7:6
sell 35:14,20	settlement 3:3	signed 8:9 24:20	slightly 44:24	South 39:13
40:22 56:21	14:19 20:10	31:24 38:12	slips 94:22	space 81:14
59:11 62:8	24:25 25:1	88:14 91:12	slot 61:9	speak 46:9
68:5 92:6,8	26:7 30:23	significance	sluggish 103:14	58:18
selling 61:19	31:2,18 37:25	102:17	small 69:3 88:2	speaker 11:15
senator 8:14	49:20 52:21	significant 4:1	108:9	11:16,17,20,22
50:8	54:16 61:15	49:16 61:5	smart 63:15	19:16 53:24
senators 52:3	63:12 76:1,5,6	88:5 105:20	103:17,18,19	speaking 75:4
send 43:2,8 49:8	76:15 85:23	significantly	smoke 80:19	special 65:14
72:11 76:19	99:17 100:9	60:2 94:2	94:3	84:13
99:11,11,12	107:21 111:10	similar 28:12	SMUD 7:24	specialized
101:25	111:15	73:19 82:22	so-called 44:3	65:14
sending 106:22	settlements 25:2	84:7 96:3	57:16	specific 8:19
senior 41:24	61:16	simple 54:7	social 31:14 32:8	specifically 22:8
sense 68:8 69:6	seven 32:20	55:15	49:6 75:12	speech 26:18
73:9 75:14	78:22	simply 10:20	society 17:10	speeches 21:2
78:15 87:1,2,3	seventh 42:2	54:20 68:1	sold 61:18 62:11	speed 73:12
sent 21:5,11	shape 64:5	single 37:15	62:22 79:11	spend 5:18 54:3
32:6,7,10 78:5	share 38:8 41:19	51:16 66:17	93:2	63:2
78:25 81:15	105:9	84:18	sole 35:20	spent 13:2 23:10
sentences 32:20	shared 5:7	Singleton 2:7	solicitation 78:6	81:3
sentimental	shareholder 4:2	6:24 7:2 21:12	somebody 35:16	spill 25:5 26:15
23:14	41:17 62:17	21:15 28:6	42:7,20 49:5	32:6 33:2
separate 65:15	shares 41:19	33:21 38:23	53:18 64:21	spoken 40:25
69:16,18	62:8 89:5,13	39:23 43:16	76:14 78:11,12	46:3 85:16
107:25	sharing 111:23	44:2 49:15	93:7 102:25	spot 96:23
separately 65:4	Sharon 96:2	79:8 84:15	103:10	spouse 102:3
65:5	sheet 43:3	86:22 92:13	someday 33:3	spring 45:4
separates 66:2	shelter 33:24	93:13 100:22	60:2	square 65:24
September 35:8	90:19	104:14 110:7	somewhat 41:3	66:9,24
38:25	shield 57:20	Singleton's 2:15	Sonoma 56:25	staffing 30:17
sequence 85:17	short 49:15 91:1	sir 14:13 15:15	soon 7:16 8:4	stalwart 42:22
series 21:11	91:10 108:17	107:20 109:17	20:24 47:16	stand 18:7
42:25 49:3	Shorthand	sit 101:20	48:14,22 62:13	standard 92:17
served 58:14	113:1	site 77:5	62:14,21 72:13	standing 73:10
			', ',	

				Page 133
standpoint	Steve 98:24	string 37:7	Suite 113:23	104:25 105:3
42:11 92:15	101:13,16	string 37.7 stronger 22:14	sum 104:11	110:7,13,20
99:24 103:14	stick 102:6	22:20	summary 19:1	surprised 71:25
stands 65:10,16	Stifel 35:10	strongly 6:10	summer 29:12	survive 66:23
stands 05.10,10 star 14:3 19:13	stock 4:4,12,13	10:16 16:3	36:12 81:20	93:8,19,21
21:7 78:20	13:14,16,17,18	25:16 55:14	superior 3:8	survives 24:9
82:2 95:24	18:6,8,12,13	struck 68:18	23:25	survivor 29:17
start 2:10,16	18:14,16 37:11	structural 53:6	supply 30:6	29:18 54:5
19:12 46:6	37:15 38:8,10	structure 53:4	suppry 30.0 support 4:16	75:5,8
59:11 66:9	39:3,7 40:22	81:5 86:6,16	5:10 8:16,22	survivor's 79:21
77:21 78:24	43:5 54:4,6,8	structured 33:7	10:16 11:3	survivors 23:3,6
		structures 69:10		26:12 36:18
96:5,24 started 24:2	54:12,19,23		14:18 16:3,8 16:19 18:1	37:12 41:7
	55:1,1,2,16	70:11,15		
34:20 40:14	59:2,8,14,15	stubs 97:11,13	22:5 28:11	44:8 57:8,16
72:20 100:3	59:18,19,23,25	stuck 13:8	44:16 45:2,25	59:3 83:7 90:6
111:7	60:1,4,11,12	stuff 23:16 77:6	46:18,21,22	90:6 96:5,9
starting 7:21	60:19,23 61:4	100:13	49:24 50:2	sustained 93:16
97:11	61:18,19 62:9	submit 104:16	52:6 55:14	sweet 96:22
starts 51:14	62:22,24 63:8	submitted 29:7	56:8 73:24	swing 47:10
101:2	63:8,14,17,19	81:23 84:5,10	74:5 78:5,8	switch 6:24 59:1
state 8:11,12	63:23 64:3,7,8	subordinate	supported 6:2	78:19
12:18 16:5	67:17,18 68:21	66:15	16:18 52:11,12	system 8:20 24:4
35:3 36:23	87:20 89:5,6	subro 109:5	supporting 4:25	69:22,25 70:4
38:22 43:18,20	89:13,15,16,23	subrogating	6:10,13 26:20	70:8
43:25 50:7	90:2,4 94:14	66:4	28:8,10 48:12	T
51:1,9 55:6,9	94:14,23 95:13	subrogation	52:17	
56:15,21 58:21	95:15,19 96:14	17:17 57:17	supportive	table 4:9 58:16
60:7,8 66:20	96:22,24 99:18	substance 3:16	12:15 28:1	tactic 21:21
66:21 108:20	101:2 109:7	5:22	supports 16:6	tactics 27:5
113:5	stock's 61:13	substantially	51:1	tag 27:22
statement 59:16	stole 32:6,8,14	8:18 35:10	suppose 100:17	take 7:14 11:6
75:18,22 76:16	stop 40:22	substantiated	supposed 3:20	18:13 21:12
77:22,24	111:12	4:1	5:23	28:14 30:22,24
statements	store 103:18	subtract 79:17	Supreme 26:10	36:13 37:16
76:12 104:1	story 46:14	sudden 4:10	sure 7:10 11:5	39:8 40:11
States 1:1 35:1	straight 27:13	Sue 101:10	11:10,17 20:17	46:23 50:9
101:20	98:6	sued 24:15	21:15 33:14	53:8 54:5
Statistically	strange 40:14	suffer 93:25	34:9 53:9 69:2	55:16 60:11,21
103:4	streamlines	suffered 16:1	70:25 74:20	63:4,8,16 79:6
stay 38:20 82:5	22:10	suffering 15:24	79:8 80:23	80:21 81:14
stayed 105:24	street 19:4 59:14	90:22,25 93:20	82:12,20 84:9	84:14 85:25
steep 60:22	61:4 62:10	suggest 44:7	84:15,24 85:25	88:2,11,16
steeply 60:14	68:17 107:13	84:1	86:2 87:5,9	89:7 90:1,2,24
step 20:9 110:19	107:15	suggested 29:16	88:18 93:13	92:11 93:11
steps 55:25	strengthened	29:18 30:1	94:23 95:5	94:16 95:6,15
57:18 58:17,20	56:10	42:17 59:9	97:7 98:3	95:16 97:18
82:9	stress 23:23	79:13	103:25 104:14	100:25 104:7
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	

				Page 134
104:12 110:11	39:10 70:24	112:4	83:3 84:3	throw 61:24
111:14,15	82:19 103:3,5	thanks 54:2	85:14,17,18	74:8
taken 55:25	105:20	58:24 86:18	87:7,15 89:22	tied 67:16
58:18 60:22	telling 5:9 96:14	91:14 107:4	89:22 90:8	tight 102:15
89:23 113:12	tells 34:4,4	108:11,12	91:15 95:1,1	time 5:18 6:12
takeover 50:7	63:21 96:18	Thanksgiving	95:17 96:5,7,8	7:19 11:6 13:3
51:2	ten 32:4 106:16	43:10	98:8,13,23	14:24 15:5
takes 72:18	ten-year 33:1	theory 75:13	100:16,18,22	16:9 17:12,22
85:23 99:9	Tennessee 57:23	they'd 32:8 51:8	100:10,10,22	20:22,22 22:24
101:25 102:7	tenor 101:17	thing 3:2 4:20	101:3,22	26:8 28:4 29:3
110:20 111:14	tens 31:22	4:23 9:13,25	101:3,22	29:16 30:24
talk 3:3,11 6:24	tentative 40:13	13:10 16:13,21	104:14,20	35:19 39:16,24
8:19 12:6	term 41:25 43:3	17:24 18:10	104.14,20	40:10,23 42:19
22:22 59:2	58:6 68:1	19:1 21:10	108:10 110:7	43:10,21 44:9
64:6	terms 3:5 8:20	26:25 31:3,6,9	111:10	44:15 46:8
	35:25 58:10		third 16:9 17:14	
talked 3:17,21		31:13 36:4		51:7 54:4 59:11,17,21
21:19 23:11	66:11,13,25	42:13 48:10	26:6 31:9	, ,
31:14 32:23	67:6 71:17	54:22 61:25	34:12 36:4	61:17 72:4,18
33:21 57:19	92:15 98:20	64:2 65:11	70:1 72:15,16	75:1 82:4 88:2
65:12 67:1,2	terrible 108:1	67:15 71:21	72:18	89:25 94:20
68:11,22 71:25	Texas 35:2,3	72:14 74:8	third-party 29:8	95:2 96:9,17
72:13 74:13	102:1 113:1,2	81:6 86:2	30:4	96:21,22 97:19
86:23,24 87:17	113:5,19,24	things 3:6,9,10	thought 3:17	97:20 100:5
111:11	text 34:2 75:17	7:12 8:21	44:15 48:7	102:6,11,20
talking 5:20	77:25,25 91:17	23:13,14,14	59:7 71:5	104:1 105:21
27:3 33:23	103:21	31:5 38:19	101:18 105:19	106:12,25
34:18 65:18	texting 73:2	66:2,12 68:7	thoughts 2:18	110:11,23
79:23 94:7	texts 103:19	68:21 81:8,19	46:8 48:1	111:17
97:19 101:16	thank 2:2,21	81:21 94:4	100:21 108:17	timeline 36:7
tally 98:14	6:15,20,21 7:2	97:14	110:15	timely 22:10
tank 62:9	7:3 12:10	think 2:3 3:19	thousand 65:3	56:20
task 20:8	13:21,22 14:14	5:7,8,20 7:4,15	92:21	times 26:10
tax 32:10 97:13	15:8,14 19:10	9:18 13:13	thousands 6:6,6	61:19 70:2,6
TCC 4:6 39:2	19:22 20:25	15:23 17:21	15:10 31:22	75:19 84:10
42:17 52:9	22:25 26:3,4	23:2,4 25:23	69:24	103:5
62:11	35:17 55:18	25:24 26:6,13	threatened	title 53:14
TCRR 113:19	58:25 61:23	26:24 27:23	60:10	today 13:12 14:7
team 15:19,23	70:17,21 74:6	28:2,5,10	threatening	21:5 55:1 99:9
45:8	76:13 80:16	32:25 38:22	55:10	today's 106:11
technology 14:3	81:24 97:22	41:17 43:22	three 3:12 12:13	told 13:4 40:11
33:25	101:10 105:16	46:13 49:17,20	26:10 30:10	44:15 47:12
telephonic 1:9	105:23 106:2	50:8,11 58:17	34:19 46:11	76:4 88:7
6:23,23 74:11	107:17 108:18	58:19,22 63:18	56:23 80:2	98:15 111:7
105:21 106:17	109:13,14,16	64:19 65:22	87:11 94:17	Tom 40:24 42:9
tell 2:18 15:10	109:18,19	68:8 69:6 74:3	95:3,13	44:12 45:15
19:20 31:10,13	110:4,5,16,23	77:21 78:4	three-firm 15:19	ton 75:18
31:17 36:4	111:18 112:1,2	79:1 82:10	threes 72:14	tools 56:12
			l	

	•	1	<u> </u>	
top 18:15 54:11	109:20	turning 74:3	95:12 110:18	43:23 83:20
102:4 103:1	trial 59:14	turns 85:6	understanding	96:19 97:14,16
tort 23:24 26:7	107:24	twice 69:23 70:5	16:19 17:3	usual 2:6
31:21 44:6	tried 11:24	71:15 91:18	61:12 62:20	usually 10:8
62:3 76:3 88:9	23:22	two 7:12,15	undoubtedly	80:25
100:9	trimming 57:2	10:14 12:13	71:9	utilities 7:23,24
total 36:16	Trinity 84:8	15:2 17:22	unfortunate	55:24 56:9
41:21 42:2	Trostle 5:5	20:5 32:12,18	102:24	107:23
98:10	Trotter 28:21	36:1 38:19	unfortunately	utility 3:24,24
totally 64:21	49:11 54:10	40:7 41:12	9:20 32:13	4:22 5:13 7:17
touch 16:22	64:15 65:13	42:4,10,15	93:4,22 94:1,7	7:25 8:3 22:15
18:10	84:13 87:17	46:1 61:24	95:14	43:11,11 50:21
touched 16:10	Trump 101:22	68:21 71:15	unheard 10:15	51:3,10,18,19
17:20 18:2,6	trust 18:13,14	73:12 79:3,9	UNIDENTIFI	51:23 57:24
67:14	29:7,15 30:19	80:11 91:16,17	11:15,16,17,20	63:24 94:23
tough 58:20	30:20 54:9,24	91:18,22,22,25	11:22 53:24	107:23
town 1:9 2:3,12	59:9 60:18	98:22 104:15	unique 64:20,21	utilize 81:13
6:23 32:23	62:5,25 87:25	108:4	65:12 80:3	utilized 61:20
33:15,20 74:11	89:16,23 95:16	two-and-a-hal	unite 106:21	utilizing 61:16
99:6 104:5	95:17	104:4	United 1:1 35:1	
105:21 106:17	trustee 30:5	two-thirds 83:7	101:20	V
track 40:3	33:8 49:11	83:9,13,14	unknown 75:25	Valdez 25:5
trade 60:2	62:10,12 63:5	97:24 111:9	unknowns 4:16	26:9
traded 55:1	84:13,17,23	type 8:17 19:13	unloaded 18:16	Valley 57:23
trading 40:22	85:1 86:23	21:7 53:21	54:13,19	valuable 24:19
59:21 63:20,22	96:12 97:9,15	95:24	unloading 77:4	35:24
63:23	99:22 101:2	types 53:22 58:3	unprecedented	value 21:24
tranche 87:14	105:10	typically 10:7	13:7 25:8	23:16 37:15
tranches 87:11	trusts 85:17	32:1 88:10	unrealistic 9:18	57:14 59:10,15
transaction 57:6	100:9		unrelated 44:12	61:5 62:9 79:3
transcribed 99:9	try 3:1 12:6	U	70:13 93:15	79:5,10,14
transcript 99:8	23:25 32:1	U.S 102:7	94:8	80:7,13,13,15
99:13	36:13 41:5,12	U.S.C 83:3	unrepresented	83:7,11 84:21
transcription	66:22 68:8,19	ultimately 26:10	77:1	92:18,24 93:5
113:6	68:20 69:7	unanimity 44:9	unsubstantiated	various 35:1
transfer 35:14	74:14 82:3	unanimously	5:25	45:14
transform 50:20	87:5,21 107:1	28:5 44:7	untoward 73:5	vast 90:3
transition 68:4	111:23	unclear 5:24	unwilling 60:21	verdict 26:11
translated 71:2	trying 13:24	undefined 5:25	upcoming 51:15	viability 55:11
transparent	37:16 40:22	underinsurance	update 3:18	60:10
76:1	43:1 95:4,11	64:22,24	76:19	viable 6:1,1
trapdoors 75:6	100:1	understand 6:18	updated 41:14	21:20 24:7
treatment 65:14	Tubbs 19:17	18:17 20:3	upgrades 58:4	67:12 70:16
tree 57:2	38:21 40:17	23:12 24:25	upgrading 57:2	victim 18:13
trees 25:11	52:4 97:1	25:3 61:21	upstairs 56:5	19:20 66:17
79:25	turned 3:16 12:8	63:14 69:19	upward 29:20	victim's 79:20
tremendous	57:21	76:21 92:14	use 30:22 33:25	victims 6:6 7:9
	<u> </u>	·	l	<u> </u>

Case: 19-30088 Doc# 7129-25 Filed: 05/08/20 Entered: 05/08/20 15:06:44 Page 52 of 55

				Page 136
10.1 6 14.16	104.2 106.11		90.4.12.01.16	02.1 05.11 10
10:1,6 14:16	104:3 106:11	want 2:19,22,25	89:4,12 91:16	82:1 85:11,18
14:21 15:1,4	107:10 108:7	3:3,11 5:3 8:16	93:7 94:14	88:15 92:16,18
17:5 18:4 21:6	108:14 109:6	10:2 11:9	96:3 97:1,24	95:8 96:15
23:2 24:1,5	109:12 110:12	12:10 14:16	98:25 101:13	98:1,3,9 105:7
28:8 33:14	110:13,13,23	15:10,19 16:2	104:10 110:11	110:19
34:7 36:15,17	voted 19:3 28:4	16:13 17:24	wasn't 95:8	ways 56:7 79:10
36:22 37:19,21	34:10 44:7	18:10 19:12	water 36:18	80:11
38:14 39:6	52:14,16 71:14	20:13,13,16	39:13	we'll 8:19 14:6,8
52:16 55:3,12	82:8 111:3,3,4	28:14 30:24	Watts 2:1,2 6:21	19:14 29:10
55:15 60:17	111:4	31:3,6,10,13	11:14,23,25	37:18 38:16
66:3,16 67:11	voters 17:1	32:24 34:16	12:6,9 13:2,22	52:17 61:16
87:9 108:25	46:20	36:4 38:16	14:13 15:8,14	63:2,7,8 65:14
109:1	votes 34:2 71:16	40:21 42:7	19:11 21:1	74:14 76:10
victims' 18:12	82:14,25 91:17	54:22 55:19	22:25 26:4	81:19,21 82:2
18:14,20 22:13	91:22,23,25	59:1,1,2,4	28:2 30:21	95:25 97:14
54:9,18,24	96:4 98:5	64:14 67:17	54:2 55:18	99:5,11 100:4
59:9 60:5,18	102:11	71:22,22,24	58:25 61:11,23	106:7,9,11,12
89:16 109:8	voting 4:5,5	72:9,21,22,24	65:17 69:8	106:14 111:4
view 13:20	47:22,23 52:15	73:4 74:3,15	70:17 72:5	111:23 112:2
19:20 52:22	72:1,2 74:16	74:25 75:1	74:7 76:13	we're 3:4,4 4:4,5
108:10	77:25 78:1	77:7 79:6 80:5	77:20 79:6	4:11,25 5:20
views 14:1	90:11 97:25	80:21 81:2	80:16,21 81:25	6:10,11,13,22
violate 68:19	101:16 106:14	82:5,11 85:25	82:10 83:1,20	11:11,25 13:24
Virginia 35:5	106:15 108:21	86:25 88:16	84:6,12 85:14	15:24 17:9,17
virtual 61:8	VP 58:14	89:20 92:11	85:25 86:19	18:2 19:24
virtually 12:13		93:11 94:16	87:10 88:16	21:3,8 24:9,25
12:21 27:17	W	97:5 98:21	89:1,7,22	25:21,22,23
vote 4:7 10:1	Wagner 40:24	101:10,15,18	90:24 91:21	26:8 27:2,3
11:7,8,10	41:4 42:9	102:16,18	92:11 93:11	29:11 33:6
12:20,22 14:23	44:12 45:15	104:3,3,7,12	94:12,16 95:1	36:15 38:11
20:18 28:16,18	47:14,14 48:1	105:3,16,23	96:7 97:5 98:2	47:18,20 60:12
31:12 33:20	48:10,18	106:2 107:5	99:3,19 101:5	60:21 62:16
34:3,6 45:6	wait 4:18 6:9	108:14 109:18	101:14 104:12	63:15 67:24
49:5,7 55:12	9:15 10:1	109:18 110:25	105:13 107:18	68:25 72:19
68:8 71:14,21	71:22,23,23	111:2,6	108:11 109:14	73:2 74:17,19
72:10,11,13,21	73:8,9,14,17	wanted 7:3,6,12	109:17 110:5	74:22 78:19
73:1,3 74:16	74:17 98:21	8:17 9:25	110:15,24,25	79:23 83:8,12
74:20,23,24,24	102:10 104:3	33:10,11 34:8	Wave 2:7	90:14 96:16,19
74:25 75:1	waiting 97:8	44:16 47:1,7	way 4:1 6:11	96:20 97:8,16
76:7 82:13,20	101:13,16	48:4 51:11	14:21 20:9	97:20 98:3,13
82:24 83:15,15	103:11,24	52:19 53:2	23:19 27:11,20	99:8,25 100:1
91:18 97:24	waiver 91:8	wanting 48:24	31:6 33:7	100:25 106:7
98:12,14,16,17	Wall 19:4 59:13	102:17	43:17 51:21	106:21 107:9
98:20 101:19	61:4 62:10	wants 7:13 72:1	55:11 58:18	108:4 109:12
101:19 102:6	68:17	76:14 79:2,4	61:19 67:9,20	110:2,20,22
101:19 102:0	WALTZ 113:1	82:8,24 83:17	72:2 73:13,18	110:2,20,22
102:19,24	113:18	85:22 86:20	73:20 79:19	we've 2:4,4,5,6
103.20,24	110.10	03.44 00.40	13.40 13.13	we ve 2.4,4,3,0

				1 490 137
2:12 9:1 10:4,5	64:13	worth 13:16	88:8 90:10,10	11 1:4 27:1,12
12:17,25 14:6	wildfires 37:3	14:5 41:19	94:3 96:23,23	44:6 56:20
19:5 23:10	57:15	59:9,10,18,19	97:21	59:22 66:7
25:4 27:23	William 41:9	65:1 67:18	year-end 41:15	67:24 83:3
34:18,25 49:2	44:14 46:2	92:19,20 93:1	87:19	1126 83:3
49:17 61:22	willing 9:22	wouldn't 48:6	years 10:8,9,14	11th 57:23
62:2 78:8,16	win 43:24	78:11	13:9 17:22,23	12 18:7 45:19
88:7 89:3	wind 38:6	wound 91:2	20:5 26:9,13	47:4
95:23 96:25	wisdom 106:23	wrap 101:7	32:4,12,21	12/31/20 113:19
99:2 100:14	wish 72:2,2	wrapped 87:5	34:22 35:2	113:21
104:6 107:11	withdraw 22:4	writing 33:2	52:24 53:1	12/31/21 113:20
108:5 109:4,11	49:24	48:1 76:1	56:23 58:12	12:00 106:12
111:16	withdrawn	wrong 54:21	94:17 95:3,14	124 41:24
website 9:8,8	22:22	74:2	107:24 108:3,4	1256 83:4
77:3 99:4	withheld 85:4	wrongful 65:11	109:5 111:15	12th 38:13
week 37:17 46:9	woefully 36:24	94:5	yeoman's 99:23	13 14:19,20 23:5
49:10 72:3	wonderful 30:21	www.firesettle	yesterday 3:18	26:6 39:3,6
76:19 111:5,24	80:1 103:7	99:5,14	5:8	44:4
111:24 112:2	word 45:22		yield 44:25	13.5 13:6,18
week's 111:20	words 58:19	X	York 35:5 44:10	26:24 27:3,20
weekend 2:3	63:2		you-all 20:4	43:4 84:19
99:10	work 15:18	Y	90:15 105:24	107:22
weekly 3:17	34:24 42:23	y'all 14:17	young 13:4	14 36:21 37:18
32:25 74:11	59:13 60:25	Yanni 28:22	young 13.4	14.9 37:15
weeks 29:2	71:18 99:24	49:12 54:10	$\overline{\mathbf{Z}}$	14:9 37:13 14th 49:4 102:9
44:11 49:2	104:17 105:8	64:19 65:13	zero 52:5 64:23	15 38:21 107:24
72:3,4 98:22	worked 13:1	84:14 87:18	Zoe 56:5	15th 9:16 47:24
weird 43:9	17:15 20:5	yeah 2:21 11:17	zone 100:14	74:17,17,18
went 3:9 26:9	21:22,25 25:17	12:9 23:7 26:4	Zoom 2:4	87:13,14 97:25
27:10 37:15	25:19 32:12	28:2 53:9 56:2		98:1,4,14,16
38:15 39:2,22	45:15 66:14	69:12 70:20	0	98:17 102:9
45:6,8 56:5	74:10 109:4,11	74:7 80:18		106:14
63:20 65:24	working 12:15	82:7 84:7	1	16 37:18 95:23
80:25 104:20	15:21,22 17:11	85:14,21 87:10	1 10:19 38:20	16th 38:15 42:25
107:24	19:25 20:21	89:12 90:18	48:23 49:21	49:14
weren't 8:23	28:25 41:4,10	92:7,13 94:13	1.025 88:8	17 32:20 38:20
34:9	90:14 111:12	95:1 96:2	1.46 41:17 42:8	57:15 64:1
Weslayan	works 10:10	97:24 98:2	10 18:24 22:8	17th 35:8
113:23	46:9	100:22 101:5,9	26:14 32:7	18 1:9 37:18
whatsoever 50:5	world 23:21	104:9 105:16	53:1	57:15
51:12	Worldcom 25:5	107:4 108:11	10.87 41:19	180 62:25
whites 33:17	Worldwide	108:18	100 66:17 84:20	18th 41:17
Wiener 8:13	113:22	year 13:1,1 15:2	100,000 85:3	106:11
50:8,8	worry 103:2,13	20:11 21:16	1054 17:6 19:8	106:11 19 87:25 88:5
wife 56:5 90:18	worry 103:2,13 worst 27:4	27:8,8 40:13	55:9 60:9	19-30088-DM
wildfire 28:23	worst 27:4 worst-case	41:18,20 61:10	108:23 109:10	1:3
31:23 57:20	105:1	61:10 87:6	10th 102:6	1.3 1997 34:22
31.23 31.20	105.1			1/// 54.44

Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc.
(800) 745-1101

(800) 745–1101 Case: 19-30088 Doc# 7129-25 Filed: 05/08/20 Entered: 05/08/20 15:06:44 Page 54 of 55

				Page 138
19TH 113:15	46.24 49.17	45 0.17	77027 112.24	
	46:24 48:17	45 9:17	77027 113:24	
1st 45:5 71:23	106:12	4th 39:12 47:25	78 52:25	
2	26th 38:6	5	7h 39:22	
2 47:5 49:25	27th 22:2 38:8	5 21:24 36:16,20	7th 39:17 49:4	
67:5 101:1	44:20 52:11	39:21 85:12	50:3	
	102:14	5.4 87:12 88:6	8	
2.4 66:21	28th 49:18		-	
2:30 105:15,16	29.2 39:5	96:19 100:24	8.4 38:16 39:1	
20 26:9 37:1	29th 48:11	50/50 39:3	80 104:24 105:6	
66:7 85:1,4	2nd 106:13	500,000 85:2	105:9	
102:4		506 41:24	80,000 69:9	
20.5-billion-d	3	52 78:17	70:24	
37:2	3 14:3 19:13	54 42:6	84 41:19	
2007 7:21 64:13	21:7 78:21	572-2000 113:24		
2011010 113:20	82:2 95:24	59 9:14,17 43:16	9	
2016 32:16 35:4	3.9-billion-dol	51:6,8 68:15	9 59:21 66:9	
2017 97:21	66:15	5th 8:9 41:8	9,000 28:4	
2019 35:8 36:8	3:19-CV-0525	51:14	90 10:13 85:7	
37:1,24 51:5	50:15		105:3,4	
55:22	30 22:12 37:5	6	95 85:8	
2020 1:9 22:12	51:22 58:12	6,000 28:7	9th 38:25 40:2	
37:5 51:22	67:11 78:18	6.7 13:17	106:13	
52:12,13,14	97:12 102:4	6.75 4:13 10:25		
63:3 87:19	107:2,19	59:9,18 60:3		
103:13 113:16	30,000 7:9 69:10	60:14,17 67:18		
2021 63:1,11	70:15	60 16:11 43:19		
87:6,13,20	3000 113:23	66:8		
2022 63:10	306 9:3,8 43:12	630 42:3		
87:15	51:5	6402 50:14		
20th 37:14 45:21	30th 14:25 36:8	650 87:13		
46:17 50:14,16	49:19 67:8	650,000 92:21		
52:13	108:24	6813 113:19		
21 37:24	31st 38:3 47:22	6th 20:11 43:1		
21-billion-doll	83:14	44:1 52:9		
67:13	325 41:21			
21st 102:13	34 82:1	7		
	34.45 39:20	7 37:21 38:14		
22.4 54:25	350 85:16	67:25		
223 113:23		7-and-a-half		
23 34:22 35:1	3rd 28:3	57:5		
23.59 38:8	4	7.8 52:25		
235 113:23	4 56:24	70 44:5		
23rd 40:15 45:5	4,600 105:21	70,000 30:15		
46:14	400,000 85:3	700 87:14		
24th 43:12 51:5	/	713 113:24		
25 34:23 57:14	400,000-dollar	750,000 92:19		
97:12	64:22	77,000 84:18		
25th 41:2,4	408.7 41:22	77,000 07.10		
	l	l	l l	

Worldwide Court Reporters, Inc. (800) 745-1101